DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 466 CE 000 491

AUTHOR	Hallman, Howard W.
TITLE	Pilot Comprehensive Manpower Program; Implications of Its Experience for Local and State Manpower Organization.
INSTITUTION	Center for Governmental Studies, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-21-11-73-44-1
PUB DATE	Oct 73
NOTE	107p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Community Programs; *Labor Market; Local Government; *Manpower Development; Manpower Needs; Manpower Utilization; Metropolitan Areas; *Pilot Projects; *Program Development; Rural Urban Differences; State Government; *State Surveys; Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

The Department of Labor has embarked upon a series of pilot projects known as the Comprehensive Manpower Program (CMP) in order to test means for implementing manpower services delivery systems serving whole labor market areas. The CMP provides five metropolitan models, based upon variations in number of counties within the SMSA and types of eligible prime sponsors, but it has no models for several other sizable groups of metropolitan areas. The three statewide CMP projects provide models which might be useful in states where SMSA population is less than 50 percent but not in the states with a majority of residents living in metropolitan areas. However, the CMP state projects provide useful experience for manpower organization in nonmetropolitan districts in all states. (Author)

ED 083466

CE

PILOT COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PROGRAM: IMPLICATIONS OF ITS EXPERIENCE FOR LOCAL AND STATE MANPOWER ORGANIZATION

by Howard W. Hallman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Center for Governmental Studies
1701 K Street, N. W., Suite 906
Washington, D. C. 20006

October 1973

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor, under research and development grant No. 21-11-73-44. Since grantees conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The grantee is solely responsible for the contents of this report. Moreover, points of view are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the board of directors of the Center for Governmental Studies.

CE000 491

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

STANDARD TITLE PAGE FOR TECHNICAL REPORTS	1. Report No. DLMA 21-11-73-44-1	2. Govt. Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
4. Title and Subtitle: Pilot Comprehensive Manpower Program: Implications of Its Experience for Local and State Manpower Organization			5. Report Date: October 1973 6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s): Howard W. Hallman			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address: Center for Governmental Studies, 1701 K Street, N. W., Suite 906, Washington, D. C. 20006			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No. DL 21-11-73-44
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Research and Development, 1111 20th St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20210			13. Type of Report & Period Covered: Final 14. Sponsoring Agency Code
15. Supplementary Notes			

16. Abstracts

The Department of Labor has embarked upon a series of pilot projects known as the Comprehensive Manpower Program (CMP) in order to test means for implementing manpower services delivery systems serving whole labor market areas. The CMP provides five metropolitan models, based upon variations in number of counties within the SMSA and types of eligible prime sponsors, but it has no models for several other sizable groups of metropolitan areas. The three statewide CMP projects provide models which might be useful in states where SMSA population is less than 50 percent but not in the states with a majority of residents living in metropolitan areas. However, the CMP state projects provide useful experience for manpower organization in nonmetropolitan districts in all states.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Manpower, Local Government, State Government, Rural Areas, Urban Areas

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Pilot Comprehensive Manpower Program, Manpower Program Organization, Manpower Planning, Manpower Revenue Sharing, Manpower Program Reform

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5A, 5D

18. Distribution Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield Va., 22151.	UNCLASSIFIED	97
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price

PREFACE

Reform or organizational arrangements for delivery of manpower services has been progressing for several years. Although no legislation has been finally adopted by Congress and signed by the President, serious efforts are now underway to modify the statutory basis of federal manpower programs. Meanwhile, the Department of Labor (DOL) has been engaged in a variety of administrative approaches to manpower reform.

One of these is the Comprehensive Manpower Program (CMP), a pilot program which commenced in the early months of 1973. Its purpose is to test means for implementing manpower services delivery systems serving whole labor market areas. As this approach got underway, the Labor Department made a grant to the Center for Governmental Studies for a six months study to review, analyze, and document the experience in establishing CMP projects in several metropolitan areas and states and to examine the implications of this experience for the design and development of future efforts of manpower reform.

Starting in mid-April 1973, Everett Crawford, who was the Center's director of federal program studies, made visits to Albuquerque, Omaha, Hartford, and the State of Utah which were carrying out CMP projects, and he also conferred regularly with DOL personnel about other aspects of manpower reform. In August Crawford had an opportunity to take a responsible position in the Department of Labor, and Howard W. Hallman, president of the Center, took over the project. By then the Department of Labor had increased its own staff evaluation of the CMP projects, making further field work by the Center not entirely necessary. At this point Hallman, with DOL concurrence, directed the

final report to a focus upon the implications of the Comprehensive Manpower Program for manpower organization in other states and localities. In doing so, he drew upon and updated earlier analyses which the Center had made of state and metropolitan manpower organization.

This report is based upon a variety of sources. Information on CMPs is derived from field reports written and documents obtained on Albuquerque, Omaha, Utah, and Hartford by Everett Crawford; proposals from the individual CMP projects in DOL files; interviews with DOL staff; "Comprehensive Manpower Program Pilot Projects: Status Reports, August 17, 1973" prepared by the Office of Field Coordination, Deputy Manpower Administrator; and "Background Papers on the Pilot Comprehensive Manpower Program Experience" prepared for the National Governors Conference.

State CAMPS plans for Fiscal Year 1974 and State PEP applications for full funding, Fiscal Year 1972 in DOL files were perused to determine patterns of state organization for balance-of-state. Population data came from the U. S. Census, adjusted to apply 1970 population figures to the 1973 definition of SMSAs. Census tabulations made by the National Association of County Officials were used.

Two previous studies of the Center were utilized: "Metropolitan Manpower Organization" and "State Manpower Organization," both published in 1970, and also the file material related to those studies. "Perspectives of Multi-jurisdictional Manpower Planning" by the National League of Cities/U. S. Conference of Mayors provided several useful case studies. The author's personal knowledge of states and localities was also relied upon.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface		i
Summary of Findings and Recommendations		vii
I.	Recent Approaches to Local and State Organization for Manpower Planning and Coordination	1
	Concentrated Employment Program	2
	Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning System	3
	Community Work and Training Program	4
	A-95 Clearinghouse	5
	Legislation, 1969-70	6
	Public Employment Program	7
	Manpower Revenue Sharing	8
	Pending Legislation	8
	Composite Prime Sponsor	9
	Grants to National Organizations	10
	Political Jurisdictions versus Labor Market Areas	11
II.	Overview of CMP Experience	13
	Definition	13
	Areas	13
	Initiation	14
	Manpower Experience	15
	Multi-jurisdictional Agreements	15
	Phasing-in	16
	Product	17
	Flexibility	18
III.	Manpower Organization for Metropolitan Areas	19
	A. One-County SMSAs	21
	1. Only the County Eligible: Luzerne Model	21
	2. Consolidated City-County	26
	3. One Prime Sponsorship, City or County: Albuquerque Model	27
	4. Two Prime Sponsors Possible, City and County	29
	5. Three or More Prime Sponsors Possible: Dade County	32
	6. Not Eligible for Prime Sponsorship	36
	B. Two-County SMSAs	38
	1. Only One County Eligible	38
	2. Two Counties Eligible	41
	3. One Prime Sponsorship, City or County: Omaha Model	43
	4. Two Prime Sponsors Possible, City and County	46
	5. Three or More Prime Sponsors Possible: Seattle Model	48
	6. Not Eligible for Prime Sponsorship	51

C. Three County SMSAs 53

D. SMSAs with Four or More Counties 57

E. New England SMSAs 62

F. Virginia SMSAs 65

G. Multi-State SMSAs 66

H. Summary on Prime Sponsorship with SMSAs 69

IV. State Manpower Organization 73

I. Nonmetropolitan States with No Eligible Local Prime Sponsors 73
New Hampshire Model 76
Elsewhere 77

J. Nonmetropolitan States with One or More Eligible Local Prime Sponsors 79
South Carolina Model 79
Elsewhere 79

K. Geographically Large Western Metropolitan States with One Dominant SMSA 82
Utah Model 82
Elsewhere 83

L. Middle-Size Metropolitan States 85

M. Geographically Small Metropolitan States 88

N. Mega-States 91

O. Summary on State Prime Sponsorship 93

Glossary 97

Tables

Metropolitan Areas

A-1	One County SMSAs with Only County Eligible	24
A-2	One County SMSA with Consolidated City-County	26
A-3	One County SMSAs with Only One Prime Sponsorship Possible, City or County	28
A-4	One County SMSAs with Two Prime Sponsors Possible, City and County	31
A-5	One County SMSAs with Three or More Potential Prime Sponsors	35
A-6	One County SMSAs Not Eligible for Prime Sponsorship	37
B-1	Two County SMSAs, One Eligible Prime Sponsor	39
B-2	Two County SMSA, Both Counties Eligible Prime Sponsors	42
B-3	Two County SMSAs, One Potential Prime Sponsor, City or County Eligible	45
B-4	Two County SMSAs, Two Potential Prime Sponsors	47
B-5	Two County SMSAs, Three or More Potential Prime Sponsors	50
B-6	Two County SMSAs, No Potential Prime Sponsors	52
C	Three County SMSAs and Eligible Prime Sponsors	55
D-1	SMSAs with Four or More Counties and Three or More Eligible Prime Sponsors	59
D-2	SMSAs with Four or More Counties and Two or Less Eligible Prime Sponsors	60
E	New England SMSAs	64
F	Virginia SMSAs	65
G	Multi-State SMSAs	67
H	Patterns of Prime Sponsorships in SMSAs	72
I	States	
I	Nonmetropolitan States with No Eligible Local Prime Sponsors	78
J	Nonmetropolitan States with One or More Eligible Local Prime Sponsors	81
K	Metropolitan State, Geographically Large, One Dominant SMSA	84
L	Middle-Size Metropolitan States	87

Tables

M	Metropolitan States, Geographically Small	90
N	Mega-States	92
O	Major State Groups by Extent of Metropolitanization	96

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department of Labor has embarked upon a series of pilot projects known as the Comprehensive Manpower Program (CMP) in order to test means for implementing manpower services delivery systems serving whole labor market areas. Experience with these pilot projects has implications for organization in metropolitan areas and balance-of-state under manpower program reform.

Metropolitan areas. In terms of eligible prime sponsors, eleven basic patterns exist in SMSAs. CMP projects provide five models: only the county eligible as prime sponsor (Luzerne County); city or county but not both eligible (Albuquerque and Omaha); county and two cities eligible (Dade County); one city and two counties eligible (Seattle); and principal city eligible in a New England SMSA (Hartford). Of the other patterns, two exist in quantity which are not represented in CMP experience: (a) where both central city and surrounding county are eligible and (b) where there are from three to nine prime sponsors within a single SMSA (and differ structurally from the Seattle and Dade models). Therefore, more attention needs to be given to these situations, which are much more complex politically and administratively than the CMP projects.

States. The 50 states and District of Columbia can be divided into six subgroups. Two CMP projects provide models for subgroups of nonmetropolitan states, New Hampshire for nine states with no eligible local prime sponsors and South Carolina for ten states with one or more eligible local prime sponsors. Utah is one of six large metropolitan states in the West with a single dominant SMSA, but the Utah CMP probably cannot be duplicated elsewhere because the SMSAs elsewhere will insist upon independent prime sponsorships. The other 26 metropolitan states can find no models in CMP: the ten mega-states, ten of middle-size, or six geographically small. However, the CMP experience in South Carolina and Utah with substate planning districts (AMPBs) is relevant to similar districts in other states, and such operations deserve further study. Much broader state manpower planning should be considered, leaving to metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan districts primary responsibility for the delivery system.

I. RECENT APPROACHES TO LOCAL AND STATE ORGANIZATION FOR MANPOWER PLANNING AND COORDINATION

During the past year, the Department of Labor (DOL) has embarked upon the Comprehensive Manpower Program (CMP), a series of pilot projects undertaken in six metropolitan areas and three states. CMP seeks to implement a unified manpower service delivery system serving an entire state or a manpower planning area generally corresponding to a local labor market area. It is intended that experience with the pilot CMP projects will offer guidance for other states and labor market areas for comprehensive manpower planning and coordination under Manpower Revenue Sharing (MRS) or a block grant approach to manpower program consolidation, as now under consideration by Congress.

This report analyzes CMP experience to date for insights which may be useful to other states and labor market areas. The report also briefly recalls previous experience with other approaches to manpower planning and coordination because the nine pilot CMPs developed out of this experience and were conditioned by it. Similarly, how other states and labor market areas organize will be affected by their past experience.

After passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA) and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA), the number of categorical manpower programs grew rapidly. Within a few years, many persons both inside and outside government recognized the necessity of pulling these diverse programs together through comprehensive planning and coordinated administration. In 1967, three separate approaches were formulated: Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS), and Community Work and Training Program (CWTP). Others followed subsequently.

Concentrated Employment Program

The Concencrated Employment Program (CEP) grew out of a 1966 survey of target slum areas of eight major cities which revealed astonishingly high levels of unemployment and underemployment. CEP was designed to provide in one contract with one sponsor whatever services were necessary to enable any person in such target areas to find and hold a steady job at a decent wage. Services would include basic education, work experience, counseling, testing, guidance, on-the-job and skill training, vocational rehabilitation, medical, dental and eye care, transportation, the use of day care centers and a variety of other supportive services that make it possible for them to find and keep jobs.

The program started out in 20 cities and two rural areas and by 1969 expanded to 66 cities and 14 rural areas. As a general rule the community action agency was the presumptive prime sponsor and actually became so in most places, and the state employment service was the presumptive deliverer of manpower services. Most of the second round CEPs were in neighborhoods served by the Model Cities Program.

CEP provided the first experience with local prime sponsors of manpower programs and taught valuable lessions on how to knit together elements in the service delivery system. Because in cities it was limited to a comparatively small geographic area, it did not evolve into an areawide manpower system in most places. However, all six local areas with CMP projects have had CEPS -- in four cases (Luzerne County, Omaha, Albuquerque, and Dade County) a direct lineage of CMP. A key official in the South Carolina CMP was a private consultant to a rural CEP, and part of the Hartford CMP staff was involved in CEP, which was administered by the community action agency.

Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning System

The Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) started in 1967 through a federal interdepartmental agreement which set forth an arrangement for interagency committees of state and local officials to develop manpower plans for states and major labor market areas. In the beginning the state employment service organized state and local CAMPS committees and generally served as secretariat. In 1968 the Labor Department gave governors and mayors of major cities an opportunity to provide leadership for CAMPS committees either by assuming chairmanship or designating the chairman. In 1969 the Department offered grants to governors and in 1970 to mayors of 130 cities so that they could hire staff to perform staff services for CAMPS committees. As of June 1973, 126 cities and four counties, one council of government, and 19 Indian tribal organizations had manpower planning grants.

In 1971 CAMPS was restructured and a new lexicon introduced to provide for state manpower planning councils (SMPC) under the governor, manpower area planning councils (MAPC) under the mayor of the largest city in major labor market areas, and ancillary manpower planning boards (AMPB) for areas in the balance of state as designated by the governor.

CAMPS committees brought together, often for the first time, representatives of various manpower agencies and provided them an opportunity to exchange information. They developed an annual manpower plan for the state or local CAMPS area. However, because of the system of categorical grants with funding allocations made in Washington or in federal regional offices, a CAMPS plan had slight chance of altering the funding pattern, and it was not intended to serve as a tool for administrative coordination. Only this year in developing plans for Fiscal Year 1974 have CAMPS committees begun to have a significant impact on fund allocation and linkage of manpower programs.

In spite of its weaknesses, CAMPS has brought together the principal actors in the manpower field and developed a data base for state and area-wide manpower planning. All nine CMP projects are direct descendents of CAMPS operations, and four of them constitute a marriage between CEP and CAMPS.

Community Work and Training Program

In the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, signed by President Johnson on December 23, 1967, Congress attempted to consolidate all manpower programs authorized by Title I-B of the Economic Opportunity Act. The Amendment required that commencing on July 1, 1968 such activities should be consolidated into a Community Work and Training Program (CWTP) and funded in each community through a prime sponsor. Furthermore, local MDTA activities were to be linked to the CWTP to the extent feasible.

Top officials in the Labor Department's Manpower Administration during the last year of the Johnson Administration stalled in carrying forth this required program consolidation because implementation would have to come through a delegation agreement with the Office of Economic Opportunity, which was insisting that community action agencies be the presumptive prime sponsor, an action opposed by the Manpower Administration. Federal manpower officials in the Nixon Administration continued to ignore CWTP during 1969 and 1970 because they were pushing for new legislation with a somewhat different approach. When this legislation finally emerged in December 1970, it contained more categorical programs than the Labor Department wanted and a public service program opposed by President Nixon and his top advisers, and the President vetoed the bill.

The Nixon Administration came back with a new legislative proposal in 1971, but since prospects were not great for speedy enactment, the Manpower Administration gave consideration to implementing a few pilot CWTP projects in order to gain experience with program consolidation. As word of this possibility filtered out to state and local manpower agencies, several places took preliminary steps to gain recognition as a pilot CWTP, including Luzerne County, Albuquerque, and Utah. Although no CWTP projects were started, conceptual design within the Manpower Administration eventually evolved into the CMP.

A-95 Clearinghouse

As these efforts to coordinate manpower programs were underway, other persons in Congress and the Executive Branch were giving attention to the need for coordination of governmental programs on a broader basis. Thus, Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 encouraged establishment of a project notification and review system to facilitate coordinated planning on an intergovernmental basis for federal assistance programs. This led the Bureau of the Budget in July 1969 to issue Circular No. A-95 which set up a network of state, regional, and metropolitan planning and development clearinghouses. (In this context, "regional" refers to sub-state regions other than metropolitan areas.)

By now there are approximately 450 areawide A-95 clearinghouses in the form of councils of governments, regional planning commissions, area planning districts, and similar bodies. Usually they have staff. Although most of them are not directly involved in manpower planning and coordination, in many states MAPCs and AMPBs of the CAMPS network observe the same boundaries.

In several states the A-95 clearinghouses outside metropolitan areas were utilized in carrying out the Public Employment Program. Utah is using associations of government organized in seven multi-county planning districts in operating its CMP, and the ten AMPBs in South Carolina's CMP function in the ten planning areas which make up the A-95 network. The Hartford CMP carries the endorsement of the A-95 clearinghouse.

Legislation, 1969-1970

In the conceptual heritage of CMP is the attempt to achieve legislative consolidation of manpower programs during 1969 and 1970. In August 1969 President Nixon sent to Congress a bill known as the "Manpower Training Act" (MTA), which would consolidate manpower programs and channel funds through the states. Locally the program would function in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) or other appropriate areas. The governors would designate a unit or units of local general government in each area to serve as prime sponsor.

When Congress worked on this proposal during the next 16 months, it rejected the use of SMSAs as the organizational basis and the funding of city programs exclusively through the state. Instead Congress passed a bill which would allow any city of 75,000 or more, any county of 100,000 or more, and a combination of units with 100,000 or more to be a prime sponsor and receive federal funds directly. Furthermore, under stated circumstances units of general local government in rural areas could become prime sponsors.

The President vetoed this bill for reasons previously stated, but since that time all legislative proposals have specified cities, counties, and combinations of units as prime sponsor and have not referred to SMSAs. However, both the vetoed bill and pending legislation have referred to "functional" or "functioning" labor market areas as one basis for organizing.

Public Employment Program

During the first half of 1971, Congress made no serious attempt to revive legislation consolidating manpower programs. Instead, it passed the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 (EEA), which the President signed on July 12. This Act provided that units of state and general local government would be eligible applicants, but for administrative purposes the Labor Department invented the concept of program agent, which would be sizable governmental units to run their own programs and to handle funds for other eligible applicants within their jurisdications. Eventually serving as program agents for the Public Employment Program (PEP) were 55 states and territories; 239 cities over 75,000; 368 counties of at least 75,000 people outside designated cities; and 23 Indian tribes and tribal organizations. For most of the counties and many of the cities this was their first experience in direct operations of a manpower program.

The governors had responsibility for program administration in the balance of state not served by city and county program agents. Two states kept all the balance-of-state funds for state jobs, five shared funds with municipalities, ten with counties, and 31 with both municipalities and counties; in some states school districts and other special districts participated also. In nine states, multi-county units of municipal consortia played significant roles in planning local programs and allocating balance-of-state funds.

All nine CMP projects have had PEP experience, and the relationships established with the balance-of-state under PEP have helped set the stage for the Utah CMP. However since PEP is phasing out, only Albuquerque, Luzerne County, and New Hampshire have incorporated EEA funds into their CMP grants although PEP is programmatically linked to CMP in the other projects.

Manpower Revenue Sharing

As Congress was working on the Emergency Employment Act in the spring of 1971, President Nixon proposed a new approach to manpower program consolidation, Manpower Revenue Sharing (MRS). The Administration's bill called for distribution of shared revenue to cities of 100,000 or more, counties with 100,000 outside such cities, SMSAs with no units of such size but where at least 75 percent of the population was in local governments forming a consortium, and other manpower consortia recognized by the Secretary of Labor. The balance of shared revenue would go to the states for areas not served by eligible local governments or consortia.

Although Congressional committees held a few days of hearings on this proposal, they made no serious attempt to report the bill or any alternative during 1971 and 1972. Despairing the prospects for legislation action, President Nixon in his January 1973 Budget Message announced an intention to achieve the objectives of Manpower Revenue Sharing through administrative actions. In draft regulations circulated in June and July, the Labor Department specified that MRS grants would go to the chief executive officer of cities or counties of 100,000 or more and to governors. Also eligible would be a consortium consisting of contiguous jurisdictions within a labor market area, all located in one state, and at least one unit having a population of 100,000 or more. Incentive allotments would be available to multi-jurisdictional consortia serving whole labor market areas.

Pending Legislation

Meanwhile in July 1973 the Senate has passed a bill known as the "Job Training and Community Services Act of 1973" (S. 1559) which consolidates manpower programs and provides for prime sponsors, which may be a state,

a city of 100,000 or more, a county of 150,000 or more (not counting the population of designated cities), a consortium of adjoining units in a labor market and including at least one eligible city or county, and a consortium to serve an urban or a rural functioning labor market area without regard to population.

Members of the House Education and Labor Committee are working on their version of manpower legislation and have not indicated how they will handle the issue of prime sponsor and population size.

Composite Prime Sponsor

From these various pieces of legislation and administrative regulations, a partial consensus emerges.

1. Manpower programs should be consolidated.
2. Manpower revenue sharing or block grants should be distributed:
   a. Partly to local general governments above a minimum size or to consortia of local governments, and
   b. Partly to state government for its own programs and the balance-of-state.
3. Minimum size for a city prime sponsor should be at least 75,000 (1970 Act, EEA) or 100,000 (other measures).
4. Minimum size for a county prime sponsor should be population outside designated cities of at least 75,000 (EEA), 100,000 (MRS regulations), or 150,000 (S. 1559).
5. Without regard to population, other consortia should be eligible to serve all or substantial portions of labor market areas if specifically approved by the Secretary of Labor.
6. State government should have a free hand in organizing program administration in the balance-of-state not served by local prime sponsors (implied rather than stated).

7. Programs operating in a whole labor market area are desirable but not required (MRS regulations provides a monetary incentive).

Grants to National Organizations

One other influence on the pattern of manpower organization needs mentioning. During the past several years the Labor Department has made grants to a number of national organizations with the stated purpose of assisting local affiliates to increase their capacity in administration of manpower programs. These include grants to U. S. Conference of Mayors/National League of Cities, National Governors Conference, National Association of Counties, National Alliance of Businessmen, AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute, National Urban League, Opportunities Industrialization Centers, Project SER, and National Farmers Union.

In addition to communicating information to their affiliates, these organizations have served as advocates for their constituencies in dealings with the Labor Department and Congress. The ones with a specific program interest have tried to retain direct funding for their local affiliates (so far NAB has succeeded but OIC and SER are losing). The ones representing governmental units have pushed for the largest possible share of direct funding for their constituents. This has led USMC/NLC and NACO to oppose funding through the states, and NACO to oppose the central city as prime sponsor for the entire metropolitan area. Each organization keeps its members informed of their rights under legislation and regulations.

In this array of interests, there has been no vigorous voice for the area-wide approach, for the organization with this focus, National Service to Regional Councils, has not had a Labor Department grant nor a major interest in manpower programs.

Political Jurisdictions versus Labor Market Areas

Emphasis upon cities, counties, and states is understandable because there is no political jurisdiction known as Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area or functioning labor market area. Nevertheless out of 263 SMSAs, 99 are encompassed within one county and one within a single city. For the 163 multi-jurisdictional SMSAs, there is no single general governmental unit to deal with the area as a whole except the Twin Cities area of Minneapolis which has its Metropolitan Council. Elsewhere, councils of governments and other federated forms serve as planning and coordinating vehicles.

Focus upon governmental jurisdictions rather than labor market areas was given further emphasis by a Labor Department decision announced on August 22, 1973 to offer manpower planning grants to 154 counties and 30 cities which had not previously received such funding. Partly this was further expression of the Department's desire to strengthen the capacity of local government in the manpower field, and partly it represented the influence of county interests.

These new planning grants will fit in easily where the county is a fair approximation of the labor market area. But in a number of instances planning will be complicated by two or more local jurisdictions with manpower planning grants for parts of the same labor market area. For example, Orange County, California -- a one county SMSA -- is entitled to a planning grant as are four of its cities in the 100,000 to 200,000 range. The City of Los Angeles previously had a planning grant, and now Los Angeles County and four other cities in the county may also. In other instances, both the central city and the surrounding county will have manpower planning grants. And whereas the binodal metropolitan area of Dallas-Fort Worth has had a single manpower planning operation through its council of governments, assisted by a Labor Department grant, the two cities and two counties all may now receive

such a grant. The Department has instructed its regional offices to promote multijurisdictional planning and undoubtedly this will occur in many places. But as a matter of DOL policy, cities and counties are entitled to go on their own.

In sum, the trend of administrative action in CAMPS planning grants, PEP guidelines, and proposed MRS regulations has been toward dealing with political jurisdictions rather than labor markets. The same is true of legislation developed by Congress. In contrast, the CMP experiment focuses upon labor market areas and seeks to achieve combined action by all jurisdictions in such areas.

II. OVERVIEW OF CMP EXPERIENCE

Definition

The Comprehensive Manpower Program (CMP) is the latest effort to strengthen local and state efforts for manpower planning and coordination. As a pilot project underway in six localities and three states, CMP has several features:

(1) a unified manpower service delivery system,

(2) serving a state or a local manpower planning area approximating a labor market area,

(3) administered by a single prime sponsor,

(4) which is a unit of general purpose government or a combination of such units, and

(5) which has maximum flexibility within existing statutes to organize and operate the delivery system in a manner best meeting locally determined needs.

Areas

The following states and areas are participating in the CMP:

New Hampshire

South Carolina

Utah

Seattle-Everett, Washington SMSA

Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, New Mexico

Omaha, Nebraska SMSA (Nebraska portion)

Dade and Monroe Counties, Florida

Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Hartford, Connecticut SMSA

Initiation

In all cases initiative for CMP projects came from political leaders and top administrators in the states and localities. The governors of the three states have made manpower a major concern, and each of them has staff closely associated with his office to develop plans and carry out operations. Seattle and Omaha have mayor-council government, and both mayors were in the forefront of obtaining federal approval for their CMPs; in the Seattle area, the King County executive also provided a leadership role, and other local elected chief executives were involved. In Seattle, the MAPC director handled staff work, and in Omaha the CEP director. The other two cities, Albuquerque and Hartford, have council-manager government, but in both cases the part-time mayor provided the political leadership; Albuquerque also had a manpower director with Washington experience and connections who took considerable initiative while the MAPC director in Hartford fulfilled this role. The manager of Dade County, an appointed official with political sophistication, was the initiator from his position as chief administrator and chairman of MAPC. Luzerne County's Congressman gave its program the necessary political push, and an official, who formerly had been CEP director and mayor of Wilkes Barre, became head of the county program and provided the necessary planning capability.

To repeat, both political leadership and technical capability at the local and state levels were behind the CMPs. In addition, the regional manpower administrators were supportive of the projects and were their advocates in dealing with Washington.

Manpower Experience

All of the localities had solid experience in the manpower programs described previously, and the CMP projects were shaped by these programs. Since in all cases planners who had been involved in CAMPS played leading roles in preparing proposals, the analytical data reflect the CAMPS methodology, and the collation of categorical parograms which characterizes most CMP projects in the beginning is similar to CAMPS. In addition, all six localities had functioning CEP projects with a unified delivery system, and this has influenced the CMPs -- ranging from Omaha where CMP is mainly an expanded CEP to Seattle where the CEP "Unicenter" will be only a small part of the metropolitan program. All the states and local governments had also run PEP programs, and while only three projects incorporate PEP directly into CMP, staff who worked on PEP are involved in all nine projects.

Federal funds paid most of the CMP development expenses in the form of personnel expenditures for CAMPS and CEP staff (and to a lesser extent PEP staff).

Multi-jurisdictional Agreements

Seven of the projects are multi-jurisdictional (excluding Luzerne County and New Hampshire). This required negotiations among elected chief executives and appointed managers fulfilling a political role. CMP built upon and grew from the relationships already established under CAMPS. In the case of Utah, experience with statewide operations of PEP was also an important factor.

In addition, there were other experiences with intergovernmental relations. Both Utah and South Carolina utilized multi-county planning districts which the governors had previously adopted, and they worked with the A-95 clearinghouses in those districts. Since Seattle has about half the population of

King County, the Seattle mayor and the elected executive of King County have many different dealings with each other to work out cooperative solutions to mutual problems, and this relationship was utilized in developing the CMP. Over the years Dade County has taken on functions considered metropolitan in nature and has worked closely with municipalities in carrying out these activities; manpower programs are one of the latest in this tradition. In the Hartford area the Capital Regional Council of Governments, composed of representatives of 27 cities and towns, passed a resolution in support of the CMP.

Phasing-in

Various federal programs are being phased into CMP projects over several months, usually when a contract or grant period ends. Albuquerque started this process in 1971 before CMP and has nearly completed it. None of the others have completely encompassed all federal manpower programs.

MDTA institutional training has been the hardest to integrate; Albuquerque has become the fiscal agent for this activity, a local operations committee is associated with the Seattle CMP, but others have mainly a referral relationship to skills centers and institutional training programs. Albuquerque and New Hampshire are sponsors of WIN, but the other CMP projects have only a referral relationship. JOBS projects are funded through CMP grants in four places (Dade, Utah, Hartford, and Albuquerque) and then subcontracted. The Employment Service is a major partner in all CMPs except New Hampshire and operates through a contractual relationship. PEP is functionally related to all projects but technically part of the CMP grant only in three places (Luzerne, Albuquerque, and New Hampshire).

In three CMPs -- Omaha, Luzerne, and New Hampshire -- the prime sponsor is the principal program operator, but all three use other agencies for some services. The other six projects delegate most program operations to other agencies.

Product

At this early stage, manpower programs are basically the same as they were before CMP. Almost all categorical programs have been retained and are run by the same program operators -- with a few but not many exceptions. The CMP plans are not much different from previous CAMPS plans in stringing together vaguely related programs. They do not represent (1) a rigorous examination of need and opportunity and (2) a design of a unified manpower service delivery system based upon determination of sequence of services required and followed by assignment of agency responsibilities.

The main device for program integration is use of a network of intake centers which can provide a full range of services and connect applicants with jobs, training programs, and specialized services.

The main exception is Albuquerque, which has begun to plan according to needed services rather than by available agencies. To put this in proper perspective, Albuquerque is beginning its third year as a CMP-type project and therefore has had time to develop its system, gather in scattered programs, and work out delicate interagency relationships. It remains to be seen how far other CMPs will be able to move into more fully integrated delivery systems serving the needs of all within a labor market area and tapping the full range of employment opportunities.

Ultimately this will be an important test, for unless this happens there is little point in pushing an areawide approach. If a locality is

only going to have a multiple package of categorical programs, it may not be worth the trouble to promote an areawide organization. Several such program packages can function in the same area without much loss. A major issue of CMP is whether an areawide approach makes any differences in results as measured by employment objectives.

Flexibility

But even before these results are in, CMP has demonstrated the importance of flexibility in dealing with localities and states. Within a framework of similar manpower programs to start with and common DOL instructions, the nine CMP projects have come up with a considerable diversity of approaches, tailored to local situations. And within the two states which are using area planning bodies, South Carolina and Utah, differences can be noted among the local programs. Even in the matter of timing, the projects are moving at different speeds as necessitated by project capacity and complications in political relationships.

Such flexibility makes the program stronger, and it would make national extension of the CMP experience more effective. Of course, a vast increase in scale from nine projects which top Washington officials can watch over to several hundred which are delegated to regional manpower administrators and field representatives would change the nature of the operation. But serious consideration should be given to how the advantages of flexibility can be maintained.

III. MANPOWER ORGANIZATION FOR METROPOLITAN AREAS

Six of the CMP projects are metropolitan area programs, serving all or substantial portions of labor market areas. Each area has a different combination of cities and counties in terms of eligibility for prime sponsorship under S. 1559 or the MRS regulations. Therefore, the CMP metropolitan experience can be explored for insights on organizational issues for those types of metropolitan areas, and by projection possible issues in other metropolitan types can be examined.

A basic factor is how many units of local general government in a metropolitan area are eligible to become a manpower prime sponsor. Where only one unit is eligible, the main issue is capability. Where two are eligible but only one prime sponsorship is possible, competitive capability becomes an issue. Where a metropolitan area can be divided between two or more prime sponsors, the question of competition versus consolidation of efforts is raised.

For analytical purposes, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) as defined by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) are the best available approximations of metropolitan labor market areas. However, it should be recognized that strictly following SMSA boundaries may not necessarily be the most appropriate or most practicable approach in organizing manpower prime sponsors. For instance, reaching across state lines may be too difficult to achieve in many multi-state SMSAs; or in a two-county SMSA the small fringe county may not want to be affiliated with the much larger county containing the central city; or for some small SMSAs a much larger area containing its hinterland, organized as a multi-county planning district, might be the preferred area.

Nevertheless, consideration of different types of SMSAs can illuminate organizational issues for manpower prime sponsors. This is done in the following pages by increasing complexity of the SMSAs in relationship to the eligibility requirements of S. 1559 and the MRS regulations. The 263 SMSAs currently defined by OMB are divided into the following groups:

99 one county SMSAs

52 two county SMSAs

30 three county SMSAs

50 SMSAs with four or more counties

26 SMSAs composed of New England cities and towns

6 SMSAs composed of Virginia counties and independent cities

Each group is then subdivided by number of potential prime sponsors: none, one (county only, city or county), two (city and county, two counties), three, four and more. Relevant CMP experience is examined where applicable and the 31 bi-state SMSAs and 5 tri-state SMSAs are discussed.

A. One-County SMSAs

There are 99 one-county SMSAs. S. 1559 would make 51 of them containing 150,000 or more people eligible for prime sponsorship, and the MRS regulations would add 31 more containing 100,000 to 150,000 inhabitants. There are several varieties.

1. Only the county eligible: Luzerne Model. Where the SMSA contains no city over 100,000, the county alone would be eligible for prime sponsorship if it contained at least 150,000 residents according to S. 1559 and at least 100,000 according to the MRS regulations. Luzerne County, Pennsylvania with 342,000 is like this because Wilkes-Barre, the largest city, has only 58,000. (Even though OMB recently combined Luzerne County with two other counties into a larger SMSA, its CMP experience illustrates this type of one-county SMSA.)

Luzerne County has a Board of Commissioners with three members. Like many Pennsylvania counties it is in transition from serving primarily as an agent of the state to taking on more activities considered municipal in nature. By a 1968 amendment to the state constitution, implemented by a 1972 statutue, the county is considered a municipality with home rule powers. As part of this trend, the CEP first developed in 1969 in Wilkes-Barre, related to the Model Cities Program, became county-wide in 1971 under the Board of Commissioners. In 1972 this Board established the Human Resources Development Department (HRDD) and appointed as director Frank Slattery, who had been CEP director and was former mayor of Wilkes-Barre. HRDD encompassed the MAPC secretariat, and in January 1973 DOL awarded it a special CAMPS planning grant. This led the way to preparing a CMP proposal.

All along the manpower efforts of Luzerne County have been actively supported by its Congressman, Daniel J. Flood, who is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee handling DOL funds. There has been no municipal opposition to the county's becoming the manpower prime sponsor.

As shown in Table A-1, there are 27 one-county SMSAs with only the county eligible to be a prime sponsor under S. 1559. All but four are located in the ten mega-states (the largest). All of them were program agents for PEP, none have had a CEP program, but all are entitled to a second round CAMPS planning grant. Only eight have cities large enough to have been program agents for PEP, only two cities (Racine and Green Bay, Wisconsin) contain over half the county's population, and none of the cities had a CEP; thus, the counties will not face much competing expertise. But since the counties' direct manpower experience is only with PEP, they cannot be expected to move very fast until their CAMPS planners are on board. Likely it will take as much as two years for them to reach where Luzerne County is now.

There are another 31 one-county SMSAs between 100,000 and 150,000 which would qualify as prime sponsors under the MRS regulations. Sixteen are in the mega-states and the remainder are scattered among a dozen states. They were all program agents under PEP, but they are not on the list for CAMPS planning grants. Only Waco, Texas in McLennan County has had CEP experience; Waco and Pueblo, Colorado received first round CAMPS grants; and these two and three other cities were large enough to be program agents for PEP. These counties might also be given CAMPS planning grants, but more study is needed to determine whether other alternatives are more appropriate. For example, in 13 out of 31, the central city contains more than half the population,

ranging up to 82 percent for Pueblo, Colorado, and maybe in some of these situations, such as Waco and Pueblo, the city would be better equipped to be prime sponsor for the entire county (the Albuquerque model). In other places, it might be preferable for the county to participate in a multi-county manpower planning organization.

Table A-1. One County SMSAs With Only County Eligible

SMSA	County	SMSA Population (000)	Population of Largest Municipality (000)	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(a) Under S. 1559 and MRS Regulations					
New Brunswick-Perth Amboy Sayreville, N. J.	Middlesex	583	98[a]	N	2
Long Branch-Asbury Park, New Jersey	Monmouth	459	54[b]	N	2
Oxnard-Ventura, Calif.	Ventura	376	71	N	2
West Paul Beach, Fla.	Palm Beach	348	57	N	2
Bakersfield, Calif.	Kern	329	69	N	2
Lancaster, Pa.	Lancaster	319	57	N	2
Reading, Pa.	Berks	296	87	N	2
Santa Barbara, Calif.	Santa Barbara	264	70	N	2
Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	Lorain	256	78	N	2
Salinas-Monterey, Calif.	Monterey	250	58	N	2
Ann Arbor, Mich.	Washtenaw	234	99	N	2
Melbourne-Titusville-Cocoa, Fla.	Brevard	230	40	N	2
Lakeland-Winter Haven, Fla.	Polk	227	41	N	2
Hamilton-Middleton, Ohio	Butler	226	67	N	2
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Dutchess	222	41	N	2
Saginaw, Mich.	Saginaw	219	91	N	2
Eugene, Oregon	Lane	213	76	N	2
Fayetteville, N. C.	Cumberland	212	53	N	2
Santa Rosa, Calif.	Sonoma	204	50	N	2
Modesta, Calif.	Stanislaus	194	61	N	2
McAllen-Pharr-Edingburg, Texas	Hidalgo	181	37	N	2
Atlantic City, N. J.	Atlantic	175	47	N	2
Racine, Wisconsin	Racine	170	95	N	2
Galveston-Texas City, Texas	Galveston	169	61	N	2
Daytona Beach, Fla.	Volusia	169	45	N	2
Champaign-Urbana, Ill.	Champaign	163	56	N	2
Green Bay, Wisconsin	Brown	150	87	N	2

Table A-1 Continued

SMSA	County	SMSA Population (000)	Population of Largest Municipality (000)	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(b) Under MRS Regulations Only					
Waco, Texas	McLennan	147	95	Y	1[e]
Lake Charles, La.	Calcasieu[c]	145	77	N	N
Yakima, Wash.	Yakima	144	45	N	N
Jackson, Mich.	Jackson	143	45	N	N
Brownswille-Harlingen-San Benito, Texas	Cameron	140	52	N	N
Anderson, Indiana	Madison	138	70	N	N
Provo-Orem, Utah	Utah	137	53	N	N
Altoona, Pa.	Blair	135	62	N	N
Waterloo, Iowa	Black Hawk	132	74	N	N
Mansfield, Ohio	Richland	129	55	N	N
Muncie, Indiana	Delaware	129	69	N	N
Decatur, Illinois	Macon	125	90	N	N
Santa Cruz, Calif.	Santa Cruz	123	23	N	N
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, N. J.	Cumberland	121	47	N	N
Reno, Nev.	Washoe	121	72	N	N
Sarasota, Fla.	Sarasota	120	40	N	N
Pueblo, Colo.	Pueblo	118	97	N	1[e]
Kenosha, Wis.	Kenosha	117	78	N	N
Bay City, Mich.	Bay	117	49	N	N
Tuscaloosa, Ala.	Tuscaloosa	116	65	N	N
Monroe, La.	Ouachita[c]	115	56	N	N
Williamsport, Pa.	Lycoming	113	37	N	N
Anchorage, Alaska	Anchorage[d]	112	48	N	N
Boise City, Idaho	Ada	112	74	N	N
Lafayette, La.	Lafayette[c]	109	68	N	N
Lafayette-West Lafayette, Ind.	Tippecanoe	109	44	N	N
Lawton, Okla.	Comanche	108	74	N	N
Ft. Meyers, Fla.	Lee	105	27	N	N
Gainesville, Fla.	Alochua	104	64	N	N
Bloomington-Normal, Ill.	McLean	104	39	N	N
Elmira, N. Y.	Chemung	101	29	N	N

a Woodbridge Township
b Middletown Township
c Parish
d Census Division
e to central city

CEP: Y = yes, N = no CAMPS grant: N = no, 1 = 1st Round, 2 = 2nd Round

2. Consolidated city-county. A variation of the one county SMSA has a consolidated city-county. The City and County of Honolulu is the only example since all other such units are part of multi-county SMSAs. Honolulu, which encompasses all of Oahu Island, has had CEP, PEP, and a first round CAMPS planning grant so that it is in an excellent position to be a manpower prime sponsor.

Table A-2. One County SMSA with Consolidated City-County

SMSA	County	SMSA Population (000)	Population of largest city (000)	CEP	CAMPS grant
Honolulu, Hawaii	Honolulu	629	629	Y	1

CEP: Y = yes CAMPS grant: 1 = first round

3. One prime sponsorship, city or county: Albuquerque model. A third situation with one-county SMSAs is where the central city is large enough to be a prime sponsor but where the balance of population is not sufficient to make the county eligible for the remainder. The county could, of course, be the prime sponsor for the entire county, but the city could not then be a prime sponsor. In other words, one or the other but not both could serve as prime sponsor. Albuquerque, New Mexico (243,000) and Bernalillo County (315,000) are like this (though technically Sandoval County to the north has been joined with Bernalillo to make a two-county SMSA).

Albuquerque with 77 percent of the county's population has a council-manager form of government, and Bernalillo County is governed by a board of commissioners. City and county work closely together and efforts are underway to consolidate the two units. In January 1972 the city and county executed a joint powers agreement to provide for shared city-county appointment of the MAPC, dual review of the annual manpower plan, but program administration by the city. Mayor Louis Saavedra (chairman of the city commission) is chairman of MAPC, a member of the state manpower planning council, and in private life is the president of the Technical Vocational Institute (which provides MDTA institutional training). Serving as director of the Office of Manpower Programs is David Rusk, who went to Albuquerque from DOL in Washington in 1971 under an assignment through the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. Together Saavedra and Rusk have provided the initiative and leadership to develop a substantially consolidated program. Rusk organized the Office of Manpower Programs in the summer of 1971 with the CAMPS planning grant and soon took responsibility for PEP. CEP was transferred from the community action agency to the Office of Manpower Programs in January 1972, NYC from the city personnel department in May, funding of MDTA institutional training in August, WIN in October, JOBS and JOPS in March 1973 when

Albuquerque was designated for a CMP project. The New Mexico Employment Service is a major subcontractor for services in five neighborhood centers, and the Albuquerque Skills Center run by the Technical Vocational Institute conducts training programs. The Albuquerque CMP has brought together more elements in a coordinated delivery system than any other CMP to date.

Under the provisions of S. 1559, there are nine other one-county SMSAs with population configuration like Albuquerque-Bernalillo, allowing for only one prime sponsor, the city or the county, as shown in Table A-3. (Under MRS regulations there would be only five because the other four would have over 100,000 population outside the city and would thus qualify the county for possible separate prime sponsorship.) Of the nine, all have had a CAMPS planning grant, but only Las Vegas, Nevada has had CEP experience. In one case -- Spokane -- DOL is offering the county a second round CAMPS grant. Otherwise, the central city will retain its manpower planning initiative.

Table A-3. One county SMSAs with Only One Prime Sponsorship Possible, City or County

SMSA	County	Population (000) Largest SMSA	City	Balance	City CEP	City CAMPS grant	County CEP	County CAMPS grant
(a) Under S. 1559 and MRS Regulations								
El Paso, Texas	El Paso	359	332	27	N	1	N	N
Tuscon, Ariz.	Pima	351	262	89	N	1	N	N
Lubbock, Texas	Lubbock	179	149	30	N	1	N	N
Lincoln, Nebr.	Lancaster	167	149	18	N	1	N	N
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	Linn	163	110	53	N	1	N	N
(b) Under S. 1559 only								
Madison, Wisc.	Dane	290	173	117	N	1	N	N
Spokane, Wasn.	Spokane	287	170	117	N	1	N	2
Las Vegas, Nev.	Clark	273	125	148	Y	1	N	N
Erie, Pa.	Erie	263	129	134	N	1	N	N

CEP: N = no, Y = yes CAMPS: 1 = first round, 2 = second round

4. Two prime sponsors possible, city and county. Nine one-county SMSAs have enough population within the central city and outside to make both city and county governments eligible to be prime sponsors under S. 1559, as Table A-4 shows. Four more would be like this under the MRS regulations. None of the CMP projects provide a model of this sort.

In the nine SMSAs, three cities -- Phoenix, Fresno, and Trenton -- have operated CEP, all nine cities have had CAMPS planning grants, and all nine counties are now being offered similar grants. This is a situation which has a potential for rivalry which might impede coordinated operations or which might produce creative tension leading to more effective programs.

Experience in the San Diego SMSA illustrates what can happen in these circumstances. The City of San Diego has a council-manager form of government with the mayor traditionally an active leader. In 1965 Mayor Frank Curren established the Mayor's Committee for Jobs as a private, nonprofit corporation which received OJT funds from the Labor Department and manpower planning funds from the Economic Development Administration. In 1970, a CAMPS grant went to the mayor's office, but when PEP came along in 1971, it was started by an assistant city manager and staff from the Personnel Department. Later PEP was assigned to a new Human Resources Department which also took charge of the model cities program and CAMPS staff, but the present mayor, Pete Wilson, remained as MAPC chairman.

The County of San Diego is governed by a five-member board of supervisors which appoints a chief administrative officer. Under the CAO are eight major agencies, including the Human Resources Agency, which has responsibility for welfare, probation, youth camps, veterans service, PEP, and by extension an interest in manpower planning (and presumably will handle the county's CAMPS grant).

Already there is friction between the city and county over manpower planning, which was accentuated when the Federal Regional Council selected the city to serve as "federal lead agency" under the "integrated grant administration." In addition, the State of California is trying to assert itself in local manpower planning, adding to the complications. Public officials are seeking a solution, which might be two manpower plans -- city and balance-of-county -- coordinated with one another, or perhaps a single plan, developed by a joint powers agency or some other coordinating vehicle. Whatever the outcome, the strong interests of both city and county introduce factors not found in any of the CMP models except Seattle. But Seattle is different because two strong political leaders serve as full time chief executives of city and county and apply their skills of political negotiation. In contrast the City and County in San Diego have professional administrators in charge with a part-time mayor and council in the city and a plural board in the county, producing a different style of city-county relations.

Of the eight other one-county SMSAs with both city and county eligible to be prime sponsor, the three California counties -- Santa Clara, Fresno, and San Joaquin -- have not been as active in manpower programs. Of the cities, San Jose has taken initiative in this field, and Fresno has conducted a CEP so that they are ahead of their counties in manpower planning and coordination. Phoenix, Arizona has had a CEP and engaged in manpower planning while Maricopa County has not been as active although it has run PEP and has had responsibility for the county-wide community action program. New Jersey counties have not been strong in human resource programs, and the cities have been more involved, particularly through community action, model cities, and related manpower programs. (This writer lacks knowledge about the Tacoma SMSA.)

Of the SMSAs considered so far, this type presents the most challenging organizational problems.

Table A-4. One County SMSAs with Two Prime Sponsors Possible, City and County

SMSA	County	Population (000) SMSA	Largest City	Balance	City CEP	City CAMPS grant	County CEP	County CAMPS grant
(a) Under both S. 1559 and MRS Regulations								
San Diego, Calif.	San Diego	1,357	693	644	N	1	N	2
San Jose, Calif.	Santa Clara	1,064	443	621	N	1	N	2
Phoenix, Ariz.	Maricopa	967	581	386	Y	1	N	2
Jersey City, N. J.	Hudson	604	260	349	Y[a]	1	N	2
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N. J.	Passaic	460	144	316	N	1	N	2
Fresno, Calif.	Fresno	413	165	248	Y	1	N	2
Tacoma, Wash.	Pierce	411	154	257	N	1	N	2
Trenton, N. J.	Mercer	303	140	199	Y	1	N	2
Stockton, Calif.	San Joaquin	290	107	183	N	1	N	2

(b) Under MRS Regulations only

SMSAs listed under Section (b) in Table A-3:

Madison, Wis.
Spokane, Wash.
Las Vegas, Nev.
Erie, Pa.

---

a Hoboken

CEP: N = no, Y = yes CAMPS: 1 = first round, 2 = second round

5. Three or more prime sponsors possible -- Dade Model (by itself). Another type of one-county SMSA has three or more prime sponsors -- the county and from two to four cities. There are four SMSAs like this, and the Dade County CMP (with its Monroe County appendige excluded) can serve as a model.

Acting under home rule power granted by a state constitutional amendment, county voters in 1957 approved a charter which created Metropolitan Dade County with broad powers over a variety of functions. Since then the county has taken on more functions deemed metropolitan in scope, and it also furnishes municipal services to 43 percent of the population living in unincorporated areas and selectively to residents of smaller municipalities. The county is governed by a nine-member board of commissioners, including the mayor who serves as chairman. The board appoints a manager, who is in charge of all county departments. Of the 27 municipalities, half are under 5,000, and only three are over 75,000 -- Miami, Hialeah, and Miami Beech. Miami and Miami Beach administered PEP, but Hialeah let the county handle its allotment, a practice not uncommon among municipalities for selected services. Already Dade County had been running the Neighborhood Youth Corps and had taken over CEP and New Careers from the community action agency, and in 1972 it took responsibility for Operation Mainstream. The county also has a model cities program.

The Dade County CMP came about because of the interest of the county manager, R. Ray Goode, in developing an integrated social services delivery system. Accordingly, he made a speech to the Federal Regional Council to enlist support and in this context sought sponsorship of a Comprehensive Manpower Program. Goode serves as MAPC chairman, and in 1972 DOL gave the county CAMPS planning funds, which were assigned to the Manpower Administration

Agency under the manager. This led to development of a CAMPS/MPC plan, which has been signed by Goode, the city manager of Miami, the city manager of Miami Beach, the mayor of Hialeah, and the development director of adjacent Monroe County. Since Metropolitan Dade County had long ago established its supremacy in broad planning and in conducting human resource programs, there was no serious resistance to its becoming the lead agency in manpower planning. (But there are other issues of tension between cities and the counties regarding administration of certain traditional municipal services.)

Of the other three one-county SMSAs with three or more potential prime sponsors, only the one encompassing Broward County is similar to Dade County in its structural make-up. It also has a board of commissioners and a county administrator, and its two largest cities, Fort Lauderdale and Hollywood, are not as dominant as many central cities elsewhere. Fort Lauderdale had a first round CAMPS grant, and Hollywood and the county are both eligible for the second round. There has been no CEP. Broward County is not as advanced in manpower planning as its neighborhood to the south, but it could learn from Dade County's experience.

In some respects, Orange County, California also has features similar to Dade County. It has a five member board of supervisors, which appoints a chief administrative officer. It has no municipality of the dominant, central-city type; rather there are four of medium size: Anaheim, Santa Ana, Garden Grove, and Huntington Beach. County and city government alike are fairly conservative and have not been aggressive in launching social programs, but they willingly undertook PEP because of high unemployment in the aerospace industry, a major employer there. Santa Ana has had a first round CAMPS planning grant, and the county and other three cities are now eligible for a second round grants. To this writer, it would be a serious error for all

five units to have manpower planners, for the county as a whole is a reasonable approximation to a labor market area even though its built-up area is contiguous to Los Angeles County and has some interchange of labor force. The cities tend to have more disadvantaged residents than the balance-of-county so that they should be major partners, but a single, unified plan is essential. But since county government does not display the initiative that Dade County does, some other form of leadership, perhaps joint leadership, may be necessary.

Los Angeles County is another matter because of the strong interest which the City of Los Angeles has long displayed in manpower programs. It has had a CEP and other manpower programs, used its CAMPS planning funds to provide staff assistance for MAPC, and has run a large PEP program. Los Angeles County is a relative newcomer to manpower programs, but it has conducted PEP and several smaller manpower programs, has a manpower planning staff in the Personnel Department (funded by an OEO grant), and is now eligible for a DOL planning grant. The county has ambition to be a major manpower planner, if not countywide at least for the balance-of-county where 60 percent of the population live in 76 cities and in unincorporated areas with over one million inhabitants. But in the past other cities, particularly the four which are also eligible for a CAMPs grant -- Long Beach, Torrance, Glendale, and Pasadena -- have wanted their own programs, and in the nineteen-sixties their pressure caused the division of the community action program into four separate agencies. Almost nothing in the CMP experience anywhere provides guidance for the Los Angeles area -- not even Seattle, the most complex of the CMPs. For the two strong, chief elected executives of Seattle and King County do not have political counterparts in the mayor of Los Angeles, who by charter

shares considerable power with city council and the city administrative officer, and in the five-member board of supervisors which runs Los Angeles County with the assistance of an appointed chief administrative officer.

Table A-5. One County SMSAs with Three or More Potential Prime Sponsors

SMSA	County (population)	CEP	CAMPS grant	Major Cities (population)	CEP	CAMPS grant
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	Los Angeles (7,032)	N	2	Los Angeles (2,816)	Y	1
				Long Beach (358)	N	2
				Torrance (134)	N	2
				Glendale (132)	N	2
				Pasadena (113)	N	2
Anaheim-Santa Anna-Garden Grove, Calif.	Orange (1,402)	N	2	Anaheim (166)	N	2
				Santa Ana (156)	N	1
				Garden Grove (122)	N	2
				Huntington Beach (115)	N	2
Miami, Florida	Dade (1,267)	Y	1	Miami (334)	N	N
				Hialeah (102)	N	N
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.	Broward (620)	N	2	Ft. Lauderdale (130)	N	1
				Hollywood (106)	N	2

CEP: Y = yes, N = no CAMPS grant: 1 = first round, 2 = second round

6. Not eligible for prime sponsorship. There remain 49 one-county SMSAs which contain fewer than 150,000 residents and have no city above 100,000 and would therefore not qualify for prime sponsor under S. 1559. However, 31 of them have a county population between 100,000 and 150,000 and would qualify under the MRS regulations. This latter group would be similar to the Luzerne County model and might look to that CMP experience. But as pointed out earlier, for the 13 where the central city holds more than half the county population, the Albuquerque model with city as prime sponsor might be more suitable.

Those under 100,000 could qualify under S. 1559 if they could show they constitute a functioning labor market area. Since 16 out of 18 of these have over half the population in the central city, and in a number of cases over 80 percent, the Albuquerque model might be examined. However, in states with a well organized set of multi-county planning districts, it might be preferable to look at these smaller SMSAs in that context. Possibly the council of governments or district planning commission could take responsibility for producing an area manpower plan and maybe a district manpower plan could have two major parts: metropolitan county (or central city) and balance-of-district, with a planning committee for each.

Table A-6. One County SMSAs Not Eligible for Prime Sponsorship

SMSA	County	SMSA Population (000)	Population of largest city (000)
(a) Under S. 1559 and MRS Regulations			
Tyler, Texas	Smith	97	57
Burlington, N. C.	Alamanche	96	32
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Minnehaha	95	72
Gadsden, Ala.	Etowah	94	53
Odessa, Texas	Ecta	91	78
Dubuque, Iowa	Dubuque	90	62
Billings, Mont.	Yellowstone	87	61
Rochester, Minn.	Olmstead	84	53
Pine Bluff, Ark.	Jefferson	85	57
Sherman-Denison, Texas	Grayson	83	24
Great Falls, Mont.	Cascade	81	60
Columbia, Mo.	Boone	80	58
LaCrosse, Wisc.	La Cross	80	51
Owensboro, Ky.	Daviess	79	50
Laredo, Texas	Webb	72	69
San Angelo, Texas	Tom Green	71	63
Midland, Texas	Midland	65	59
Bryan-College Station, Texas	Brazos	57	33
(b) Under S. 1559 only			
31 SMSAs listed under part (b) of Table A-1.			

B. Two-County SMSAs

There are 52 SMSAs containing two counties. Most of them consist of a central city and sizable population in one county and a smaller, less urbanized population in the other county. To some extent they are statistical constructs of federal officials, but in a labor market sense the two counties are related. Under S. 1559, 37 of them would have at least one eligible prime sponsor, and another seven would be brought in by the MRS regulations. They offer several variations.

1. Only one county eligible. In twelve cases, the largest city is under 100,000 but one of the counties is over 150,000 and would be eligible under S. 1559, and another seven cases have no city large enough to be a prime sponsor but one county between 100,000 and 150,000, thus qualifying under MRS regulations. These SMSAs are listed in Table B-1.

None of the CMP models are this type. However, the larger of the two counties presents a governmental pattern like the Luzerne model though none of them have had any CEP experience. All the counties over 150,000 may now receive a CAMPS planning grant. Utica and Charleston, West Virginia are the largest cities in their SMSAs and though under 100,000 they previously had a CAMPS planning grant so that two manpower planning systems will need to be reconciled.

If both counties are to be involved in a single prime sponsorship, Omaha (discussed below) is a partial model except that in this case the largest county would be the initiator instead of the largest city as in the Omaha situation. Of course, the larger county could go it alone in a prime sponsorship, leaving the adjacent county to participate in the balance-of-state program.

Table B-1. Two County SMSAs, One Eligible Prime Sponsor (population in thousands)

SMSA	Counties	CEP	CAMPS Grant	Sizable Cities	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(a) Under S. 1559 and MRS Regulations						
Utica-Rome, N.Y. (340)	Oneida (273)	N	2	Utica (91)	N	1
	Herkimer (67)					
York, Pa. (329)	York (272)	N	2	York (50)	N	N
	Adams (56)	N	N			
Greenville, S. C. (299)	Greenville (240)	N	N	Greenville (61)	N	N
	Pickens (58)	N	N			
Johnstown, Pa. (262)	Columbia (186)	N	2	Johnstown (42)	N	N
	Somerset (76)	N	N			
Kalamazoo, Mich. (257)	Kalamazoo (201)	N	2	Kalamazoo (85)	N	N
	Van Buren (50)	N	N			
Charleston, W. Va. (257)	Kanawha (229)	N	2	Charleston (71)	N	1
	Putnam (27)	N	N			
Vallejo-Napa, Calif. (249)	Solano (169)	N	2	Vallejo (66)	N	N
	Napa (79)	N	N			
Pensacola, Fla. (243)	Escambia (205)	N	2	Pensacola (59)	N	N
	Santa Rosa (37)	N	N			
Springfield, Ohio (187)	Clark (157)	N	2	Springfield (81)	N	N
	Champaign (30	N	N			
Salem, Ore. (186)	Marion (151)	N	2	Salem (68)	N	N
	Polk (35)	N	N			
Muskegon-Muskegon Heights, Mich. (175)	Muskegon (157)	N	2	Muskegon (44)	N	N
	Oceana (17)	N	N			
Springfield, Ill. (171)	Sangamon (161)	N	2	Springfield (91)	N	N
	Menard (9)	N	N			

Table B-1 continued

SMSA	Counties	CEP	CAMPS Grant	Sizable Cities	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(b) also Under MRS Regulations						
Battle Creek, Mich. (180)	Calhoun (141)	N	N	Battle Creek (38)	N	N
	Barry	N	N			
Ashville, N. C. (161)	Buncombe (145)	N	N	Ashville (57)	N	N
	Madison (16)	N	N			
Killeen-Temple, Tex (159)	Bell (124)	N	N	Killeen (35)	N	N
	Coryell (35)	N	N			
Alexandria, La. (131)	Rapides (118)	N	N	Alexandria (41)	N	N
	Grant (13)	N	N			
Wichita Falls, Tex. (127)	Wichita (121)	N	N	Wichita Falls (97)	N	1
	Archer (5)	N	N			
Sioux City, Iowa-Nebr. (116)	Woodbury, Iowa (103)	N	N	Sioux City (85)	Nq	N
	Dakota, Nebr. (13)	N	N			
Talahassee, Fla. (109)	Leon (103)	N	N	Talahassee (71)	N	N
	Lakalla (6)	N	N			

CEP: N = no CAMPS: 1 - first round, 2 = second round

Eligible jurisdictions underscored.

2. Two Counties Eligible. The Nassau-Suffolk, N. Y. SMSA is a special case. Once considered part of the SMSA which includes New York City, OMB has now defined the two counties as a separate SMSA. This is appropriate because each is over one million, and while their labor force interchanges with New York City's, they have major sources of employment within county boundaries.

Governmentally these New York counties present a unique situation because they have three tiers of local general government in part of their territory: county, city or town, and village. Incorporated villages are included within town boundaries, but extensive, developed sections of towns are unincorporated. If the towns over 100,000 -- three in Nassau and five in Suffolk, as shown in Table B-2 -- were considered a "city" under S. 1559 or "other local government units with powers substantially similar to those of a city" under MRS Regulations, they would qualify for prime sponsorship.

Presently DOL has decided that two towns in Erie County, New York outside Buffalo are eligible for second round CAMPS planning grants, but the Department has not made a similar determination for towns of Nassau and Suffolk Counties. If it did, this would create a situation similar to Orange County, California. But for programmatic reasons and in keeping with the trend toward strong, professional county government in Nassau and Suffolk, sole countywide prime sponsorship would be preferable. Or conceivably a two county prime sponsorship might be developed, although each alone is large enough to go it alone as long as they cooperate with one another and New York City in labor interchange activities.

Table B-2. Two County SMSA, Both Counties Eligible Prime Sponsors (population in thousands)

SMSA	Counties	CEP	CAMPS Grant	Towns over 100,000	CEP	CAMPS Grant
				Hempstead (801)	N	N
Nassau-Suffolk, N. Y. (2,553)	Nassau (1,428)	N	2	Oyster Bay (333)	N	N
				North Hempstead (234)	N	N
	Suffolk (1,124)	N	2	Islip (278)	N	N
				Brookhaven (243)	N	N
				Babylon (203)	N	N
				Huntington (200)	N	N
				Smithtown (114)	N	N

CEP: N = no CAMPS: 2 = second round

3. <u>One prime sponsorship, city or county: Omaha model (Nebraska portion)</u>. Another type of two-county SMSA would have only one potential prime sponsor, which might be a central city over 100,000 or the largest county but not both because the balance-of-county lacks sufficient population to qualify for separate prime sponsorship. This is like the Omaha CMP, which serves Omaha (347,000) and the Nebraska counties of Douglas (389,000) and Sharpy (63,000). (Omaha is actually a three-county SMSA, but Pottawattamie County, Iowa -- 86,000 -- is not part of the CMP.)

Omaha contains all but 11 percent of the Douglas County population. The city has mayor-council government while the county is run by a board of commissioners. When CEP came to Omaha in 1968, the city was sponsor from the beginning, it acquired a CAMPS planning grant in 1970, and it has run a Neighborhood Youth Corps project and PEP. Since 1972 these activities have functioned under a manpower director who is a mayoral appointee. Mayor Eugene A. Leahy is chairman of MAPC, Manpower Director Bob Armstrong is vice chairman, and the secretary is a city manpower planner. The CMP plan, which in many respects is an expanded CEP, was developed by city personnel and approved by MAPC. This plan was ratified in an agreement adopted by separate actions of the county commissioners and city councils of Douglas County and Omaha and adjacent Sarpy County and Bellevue (22,000), its largest city. These jurisdictions are all represented on the MAPC. Most of the CMP components are operated directly by the Omaha manpower staff, but the city has subcontracts with the state employment service, vocational education, and OIC.

There are 14 two-county SMSAs where either the central city or the larger county could be prime sponsor under S. 1559 as shown in Table B-3 (but six of these could have separate city and county prime sponsors under MRS Regulations).

Most of these have a sizable portion of the larger county's population in the central city; only Des Moines, Duluth, and Albuquerque (which is now a one-county CMP) have had CEP experience though all but one have had a CAMPS grant. None of the larger counties are now eligible for a CAMPS grant, and all but two of the adjacent counties are less than one-fourth the SMSA population (the exception is 38 percent).

Thus, it appears that the Omaha model might be workable if both counties are to be under one prime sponsorship, and the Albuquerque model would apply if only the larger county is encompassed in the manpower program area, leaving the smaller one to balance-of-state.

Table B-3. Two County SMSAs, One Potential Prime Sponsor, City or County Eligible (population in the thousands)

SMSA	Counties	CEP	CAMPS Grant	Sizable Cities	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(a) Under S. 1559						
Wichita, Kan. (389)	Sedgwick (350)	N	N	Wichita (276)	N	1
	Butler (38)	N	N			
Mobile, Ala. (376)	Mobile (317)*	N	N	Mobile (190)	N	1
	Baldwin (59)	N	N			
Albuquerque, N.M	Bernalillo (315)	N	N	Albuquerque (243)	Y	1
N. M. (333)	Sandoval (17)	N	N			
Des Moines,	Polk (286)	N	N	Des Moines (200)	Y	1
Iowa (313)	Warren (277)	N	N			
Autsin, Tex. (323)	Travis (295)	N	N	Austin (251)	N	1
	Hays (27)	N	N			
Columbia, S.C. (322)	Richland (233)*	N	N	Columbia (113)	N	1
	Lexington (89)	N	N			
Corpus Christi,	Nueces (237)	N	N	Corpus Christi (204)	N	1
Texas (284)	San Patricia (47)	N	N			
South Bend,	St. Joseph (245)*	N	N	South Bend (125)	N	1
Ind. (280)	Marshall (34)	N	N			
Rockford, Ill. (272)	Winnebago (246)	N	N	Rockford (147)	N	2
	Boone (25)	N	N			
Duluth-Superior,	St. Louis, Minn (220)	N	N	Duluth (100)	Y	1
Minn.-Wis. (265)	Douglas, Wis. (44)	N	N			
Jackson, Miss. (258)	Hines (258)*	N	N	Jackson (153)	N	1
	Rankin (43)	N	N			
Colorado Springs,	El Paso (236)*	N	N	Colorado Springs (135)	N	1
Colorado (239)	Teller (3)	N	N			
Huntsville, Ala.	Madison (186)	N	N	Huntsville (137)	N	1
Ala (228)	Limestone (41)	N	N			
Springfield, Mo.(168)	Greene (152)	N	N	Springfield (120)	N	1
	Christian (15)	N	N			

* Balance of county outside central city over 100,000 and eligible for separate prime sponsorship under MRS regulations.

CEP: N = no, Y = yes CAMPS: 1 = first round, 2 = second round

Eligible jurisdictions underscored.

4. Two prime sponsors possible, city and county. Five two-county SMSAs could have both a city and a county prime sponsor under S. 1559, and for two of these the other county would be eligible under MRS regulations. All of the cities have had a CAMPS planning grant, and now the counties are eligible for one. This sets up competition similar to that discussed early for the one-county San Diego SMSA, although none of these places have had CEP and are not as advanced in manpower as the San Diego area.

Flint, Michigan in Genessee County, to cite one example, has a manpower director working under the city manager and serving as the secretariat of MAPC, which the mayor chairs. CAMPS serves a three-county planning district identified by the State of Michigan. Lapeer County east of Genessee County was part of the Flint SMSA, but recently OMB switched it to the Detroit SMSA and in its place assigned Shiawasee County to the west. Thus by the state definition there might be a three-county prime sponsorship and by OMB's concept two-counties. But political rivalry between the Flint City Council and the Genessee County Board of Supervisors is strong enough probably to result in two distinct manpower plans within the county, leaving the outlying counties to balance-of-state. DOL's awarding separate planning grants to city and county will reinforce this tendency.

Table B-4. Two County SMSAs, Two Potential Prime Sponsors
(population in thousands)

SMSA	Counties	CEP	CAMPS Grant	Cities	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(a) Under S. 1559						
Akron, Ohio (679)	Summit (553)	N	2	Akron (275)	N	1
	Portage (125)*	N	N			
Grand Rapids, Mich. (539)	Kent (411)	N	2	Grand Rapids (197)	N	1
	Ottawa (128)*	N	N			
Flint, Mich. (507)	Genessee (444)	N	2	Flint (193)	N	1
	Shiawassee (63)	N	N			
Canton, Ohio (393)	Stark (372)	N	2	Canton (110)	N	1
	Carroll (21)	N	N			
Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ar . (323)	Pulaski (287)	N	2	Little Rock (132)	N	1
	Saline (36)	N	N			
(b) Others under MRS Regulations						
Six SMSAs with balance-of-county between 100,000 and 150,000, as identified (*) in Table B-3.						

* Eligible under MRS Regulations

CEP: N = no CAMPS: 1 = first round, 2 = second round

Eligible jurisdictions underscored.

5. Three or more prime sponsors possible: Seattle Model. Under the provisions of S. 1559, five two-county SMSAs could have three or more prime sponsors. This pattern is exemplified by the CMP for the Seattle area.

Since the late nineteen-sixties when unemployment climbed in the Seattle area, public officials have given considerable attention to employment and manpower programs. Seattle was awarded a CEP grant to go with its model cities program and worked out arrangements with state manpower agencies and model neighborhood residents for a one-stop delivery system focused in an Employment Unicenter, run by a joint board of city and state officials and neighborhood residents. In late 1970 DOL assigned funds to the area for the Employment Supplement Program (ESP), and again this required the city and state government to work out a cooperative arrangement. Meanwhile, the city got a CAMPS grant and in 1971 it started PEP, building upon the ESP experience. These programs, including the MAPC secretariat, were pulled together along with some other social programs in the Office of Human Resources under the mayor.

MAPC has encompassed the two counties of the SMSA, King in which Seattle is located and Snohomish which has Everett as its largest city. Through the initiative of Mayor Wes Uhlman and the MAPC staff, an executive committee of elected officials was formed which appointed a Seattle-King County operations committee and an Everett-Snohomish County operations committee, which in turn were represented on a joint planning committee. This structure provided the basis for developing the CMP project, and it is now ratified by an inter-local agreement adopted by the participating cities and counties. The executive committee is the decision-making body, and it consists of elected officials: mayor of Seattle (six votes), King County executive (six votes), chairman

of Snohomish County Board of Supervisors (two votes), and mayors of Bellevue Renton, Auburn, Everett, and Edmonds (one vote each). Key advocates of the CMP were Mayor Ullman and John Spellman, the elected county executive of King County. Both are strong political leaders, and although of different political parties and sometimes represent competing interests of city and county, they have worked out accommodations in order to seek solutions to many mutual problems, including unemployment.

In terms of governmental structure, the Buffalo and Youngstown SMSA are similar to the Seattle area, for two counties and the central city are all eligible for prime sponsorship. As previously noted, DOL has offered CAMPS grants to two towns over 100,000 in the Buffalo suburbs. Buffalo has had CEP but not Youngstown. This writer is not well acquainted with the local political situation, but it appears that natural city-county competition will be reinforced by DOL's offer of CAMPS planning grants to all eligible jurisdictions. In the Seattle area only the central city had federal manpower planning funds but proceeded to promote areawide cooperation, and the other jurisdictions had no opportunity to proceed on their own.

In the San Bernardino-Riverside area the City of San Bernardino has had a CAMPS planning grant and now one other city and two counties are eligible. This could lead to four plans though it might be directed toward two county plans or a single bi-county plan. In the Gary-Hammond area, two cities and the larger county, but not the smaller one, are entitled to planning grants. Gary has had the greatest manpower experience with a CEP and a previous planning grant, but historic city-county rivalry heightened by black leadership in the city and white leadership in the county seriously reduces the prospects for cooperation.

Table B-5. Two County SMSAs, Three or More Potential Prime Sponsors
(population in thousands)

SMSA	Counties	CEP	CAMPS Grant	Cities	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(a) under S. 1559						
Seattle-Everett, Wash. (1,421)	King (1,156)	N	N[a]	Seattle (530)	Y	1[a]
	Snohomish (265)	N	N[a]	Everett (53)	N	N
Buffalo, N. Y. (1,349)	Erie (1,113)	N	2	Buffalo (462)	Y	1[b]
	Niagara (235)	N	2	Niagara Falls (85)	N	N
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario Calif. (1,143)	San Bernardino (684)	N	2	San Bernardino (104)	N	1
	Riverside (459)	N	2	Riverside (140)	N	2
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind (633)	Lake (546)	N	2	Gary (175)	Y	1
				Hammond (107)	N	2
	Porter (87)	N	N			
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio (536)	Mahoning (303)	N	2	Youngstown (139)	N	1
	Trumbull (232)	N	2	Warren (63)	N	N
(b) Others under MRS Regulations (see details in Table B-4)						
Akron, Ohio						
Grand Rapids, Mich.						

[a] CAMPS grant to CMP

[b] DOL has also offered second round CAMPS grants to two towns over 100,000, Cheektowaga and Tonawanda.

CEP: N = no, Y = yes CAMPS: 1 = first round, 2 = second round

Eligible jurisdictions underscored.

6. Not eligible for prime sponsorship. Fifteen two-county SMSAs have no county over 150,000 and no city over 100,000 so that they would not be automatically eligible for prime sponsorship under S. 1559, but seven have counties in the 100,000 to 150,000 range and would qualify under MRS regulations. Of course, under the provisions of S. 1559 any of them could make the case to the Secretary of Labor that it is a functioning labor market area and thus appropriate for a prime sponsorship. In this case, a number of options could be explored: one county with county prime sponsor (Luzerne model); one county with city prime sponsor (Albuquerque model); two counties with larger county as prime sponsor (no model); two counties with central city as prime sponsor (Omaha model); two counties with joint executive committee (Seattle model); a larger multi-county area with council of governments as prime sponsor; or state-run as part of balance-of-state.

Table B-6. Two County SMSAs, No Potential Prime Sponsors (population in thousands)

SMSA	Counties
(a) Under S. 1559 and MRS Regulations	
Amarillo, Texas (144)	Porter (90) Randall (53)
Fayetteville-Springdale, Arkansas (127)	Washington (77) Benton (50)
Fargo-Moorhead, N. Dak. - Minnesota (120)	Cross, N. Dak. (73) Clay, Minn. (40)
Florence, Ala. (117)	Lauderdale (68) Colbert (49)
Wilmington, N. C. (107)	New Hanover (82) Brunswick (24)
St. Joseph, Mo. (98)	Buchanan (86) Andrew (11)
Albany, Ga. (96)	Dougherty (89) Lee (7)
Richland-Kennewich, Wash. (93)	Benton (67) Franklin (25)
(b) Under S. 1559 only	
Seven SMSAs listed in Table B-1, part (b).	

C. Three County SMSAs

SMSAs with three counties total 30 as shown in Table C. None of the CMP projects have more than two counties so that they do not offer precise models. Nevertheless, the situation in the largest county is similar to different CMPs so that some lessons are transferable. The main complication in most cases is the addition of two small counties rather than one or none, and in some instances this will not be practicable politically or administratively.

Detailed consideration of various types of three-county SMSAs in terms of potential prime sponsorship would be repetitive of early discussion. By way of cross reference, we can note that seven of them would have only one eligible prime sponsor, the largest county (or a consolidated city-county in the case of Columbus-Muskogee County, Georgia), and this would be like the Luzerne model with two smaller counties attached.

Ten three-county SMSAs could have either the central city or its county, as prime sponsor, but not both. For eight of these, the central city contains a majority of county population, so that the Omaha model is suggested with one county added (indeed the interstate Omaha SMSA is one of them). Both the other two, Raleigh-Durham and Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange have three population nodes (including Chapel Hill in the former) so that the consortium approach of the Seattle area may be a better model.

Three of the three-county SMSAs could have both the central city and the largest county serving as separate prime sponsors. This is like the San Diego situation with two fringe counties attached or like the Flint, Michigan area as defined for CAMPS planning.

Two SMSAs could have three or more prime sponsors, suggesting the Seattle model. This would be particularly relevant for the Tampa-St. Petersburg SMSA

which has two counties and two cities eligible. The Northeast Pennsylvania SMSA is a recent OMB combination of the Wilkes-Barre SMSA and the Scranton SMSA, and the situation is complicated by Luzerne already being a CMP.

The remaining eight SMSAs with three counties have no eligible prime sponsors under S. 1559 though in three a county would qualify under MRS regulations. Here the options are organizing for a functioning labor market under S. 1559 or as part of balance-of-state.

Table C. Three County SMSAS and Eligible Prime Sponsors

SMSA	SMSA Population (000)	Eligible prime sponsors under S. 1559 Total	Counties	Cities	Other eligible counties under MRS Regulations	CEP	CAMPS Grant 1	2
(a) Only One Eligible Prime Sponsor (Largest County)								
Wilmington, Del-N.J.	499	1	1	0	--	N	Ci	Co
Orlando, Fla.	453	1	1	0	--	N	N	Co
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill.	362	1	1	0	1	N	N	Co
Charleston, S. C.	336	1	1	0	--	N	Ci	N[c]
Binghamton, N. Y.-Pa.	302	1	1	0	--	N	N	Co
Augusta, Ga-S. C.	275	1	1	0	1	N	N	Co
Columbus, Ga.-Ala.	238	1	0	1[a]	--	N	Ci	N
(b) One Eligible Prime Sponsor, City or County								
San Antonio, Texas	888	1	1	1	1[b]*	Y	Ci	Co
Charlotte-Gastonia, N. C.	557	1	1	1	2[b]	Y	Ci	N
Omaha, Neb.-Iowa	540	1	1	1	--	Y	Ci	N
Raleigh-Durham, N. C.	418	1	1	1	2[b]	N	Ci	N
Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange, Texas	345	1	1	1	1[b]	N	Ci	N
Peoria, Ill.	341	1	1	1	1	N	N	Ci
Shreveport, La.	334	1	1	1	--	N	Ci	N
Montgomery, Ala	225	1	1	1	--	N	Ci	N
Savannah, Ga	207	1	1	1	--	N	Ci	N
Topeka, Kan.	180	1	1	1	--	N	Ci	N
(c) Two Eligible Prime Sponsors								
Sacramento, Calif.	800	2	1	1	--	N	N	Co
Syracuse, N. Y.	636	2	1	1	1	N	Ci	Co
Harrisburg, Pa.	410	2	2	0	--	N	Ci	2 Co

Table C. continued

SMSA	SMSA Population (000)	Eligible prime sponsors under S. 1559 Total	Counties	Cities	Other eligible counties under MRS Regulations	CEP	CAMPS Grant 1	2
(d) Three or More Eligible Prime Sponsors								
Tampa-St. Perersburg, Fla.	1,088	4	2	2	--	Y	Ci	Ci, 2 Co
Northeast Pennsylvania	621	3	2	1	--	Y	Ci,Co	N
(e) No Eligible Prime Sponsors								
Appleton-Oshkosh, Wis.	276	0	0	0	2	N	N	N
Wheeling, W. Va.-Ohio	182	0	0	0	--	N	N	N
Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio, W. Va.	165	0	0	0	--	N	N	N
Biloxi-Gulfport, Miss.	160	0	0	0	1	N	N	N
Parkersburg, W. Va.-Ohio	148	0	0	0	--	N	N	N
St. Cloud, Minn.	134	0	0	0	--	N	N	N
Abilene, Texas	122	0	0	0	--	N	N	N
Texarkana, Texas	112	0	0	0	1	Y	Ci	N

---

[a] Consolidated city-county

[b] Balance-of-county eligible

[c] To South Carolina CMP

* Based on estimated population after large annexation by San Antonio in 1972.

CEP: N = no, Y = yes CAMPS: Ci = city, Co = county, N = none

D. SMSAs with Four or More Counties

Even more complex are the SMSAs with four or more counties, of which there are 50. None of the metropolitan area CMP projects have encompassed more than two counties so that they provide limited experience for dealing with SMSAs extending through several counties.

This is particularly true for the 12 SMSAs which under S. 1559 could have five or more prime sponsors, with as many as nine in the Philadelphia and San Francisco-Oakland SMSAs as shown in Table D-1. At present only two of them seem to have an effective base for multi-jurisdictional action: Minneapolis-St. Paul through the Metropolitan Council (but excluding a Wisconsin County in the SMSA) and Kansas City through the Mid-America Regional Council. The former is appointed by the governor of Minnesota and the latter is a council of local officials, both different from the special purpose consortium of the Seattle CMP.

The Seattle experience may be more relevant to the 7 SMSAs which could have three or four prime sponsors, also listed in Table D-1. Of these, Dallas-Fort Worth already has metropolitan-wide manpower planning undertaken by the North Central Texas Council of Governments. The Atlanta area is developing strong regional planning capability. Portland and Multnomah County have a habit of cooperation and are currently considering consolidation. But the central city and surrounding counties in Baltimore and Cleveland are not as advanced in cooperative enterprises. (This writer is unacquainted with the situation in Milwaukee and Albany-Schenectady-Troy.)

The other 31 SMSAs with four or more counties could have only one or two prime sponsors, and none in two cases, as Table D-2 indicates. Within the central county, the structure is similar to cases previously considered:

twelve with both city and county eligible (like San Diego); nine with city or county eligible, but not both (like Albuquerque and Omaha); five with a consolidated city-county eligible; three with only the county eligible (like Luzerne). However, the fact that from three to seven other counties are part of the SMSA is a complicating factor, and the CMP experience sheds very little light on organizing this extensively.

Of the various kinds of SMSAs, the ones with four or more counties need the most study on how to organize a manpower services delivery system that encompasses the opportunities of the total labor market area. This is especially the case for the largest metropolitan areas, but even the smaller ones with several counties require more consideration.

Table D-1. SMSAs with Four or More Counties and Three or More Eligible Prime Sponsors

SMSA	SMSA Population (000)	Number of Counties	Eligible Prime Sponsors Under S. 1559			Under MRS	CEP	Number of CAMPS Grants
			Total	Counties	Cities			
(a) Five or More Eligible Prime Sponsors								
New York, N.Y.-N.J.	9,973	5[a]	6	4	2	--	Y	5
Chicago, Ill.	6,978	6	5	4	1	1	Y	6
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	4.817	8	9	7	2[b]	--	Y	8
Detroit, Mich.	4,431	6	7	3	4	1	Y	7
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	3,109	5	9	4	5[b]	--	Y(3)	9
Washington, D. C.-Md.-Va.	2,909	11[c]	6	4	2	1	Y	5
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.	2,410	9	5	4	1[b]	1	Y	6
Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,401	4	5	4	1	--	Y	5
Newark, N.J.	2,054	4	6	4	2	--	Y	7
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.-Wis.	1,965	11	5	3	2	1	Y	5
Kansas City, Mo.-Kansas	1,270	7	6	3	3	1	Y	4
Denver, Colo.	1,228	6	5	4	1[b]	1	Y	4
(b) Three and Four Eligible Prime Sponsors								
Dallas-Fort Worth, Tex.	2,337	11	4	2	2	-	N	4
Baltimore, Md.	2,070	6	3	2	1[b]	1	Y	3
Cleveland, Ohio	2,064	4	4	2	2	--	Y	4
Atlanta, Ga.	1,625	15	4	3	1	--	Y	4
Milwaukee, Wisc.	1,403	4	3	2	1	--	Y	3
Portland, Ore.-Wash.	1,009	4	4	3	1	1	Y	4
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.	777	5	4	3	1	1	N	4

[a] Counties within New York City not included

[b] Includes a consolidated city-county

[c] Includes three cities in Virginia independent of counties.

Table D-2. SMSAs with Four or More Counties and Two or Less Eligible Prime Sponsors

SMSA	SMSA Population (000)	Number of Counties	Eligible Prime Sponsors under S. 1559			Other Under MRS	CEP	Number of CAMPS grants
			Total	Counties	Cities			
(a) Two Eligible Prime Sponsors								
Houston, Texas	1,999	6	2	1	1	1	Y	2
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky-Ind.	1,384	7	2	1	1	1	Y	2
New Orleans, La.	1,045	4	2	1	1[a]	--	Y	2
Columbus, Ohio	1,017	5	2	1	1	--	Y	2
Rochester, N. Y.	961	5	2	1	1	--	Y	2
Louisville, Ky-Ind.	867	5	2	1	1	--	N	2
Dayton, Ohio	850	4	2	1	1	1	Y	2
Birmingham, Ala.	767	4	2	1	1	--	Y	2
Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point, N. C.	723	6	2[b]	2	2	--	Y	2
Salt Lake City-Ogden, Utah	705	4	2	1	1	1	N	1
Oklahoma City, Okla.	698	5	2	1	1	--	N	2
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J.	594	4	2[b]	2	1	--	N	2
(b) One Eligible Prime Sponsor City or County								
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.-Miss.	821	5	1[b]	1	1	--	N	1
Toledo, Ohio-Mich	762	5	1[b]	1	1	1	Y	1
Tulsa, Okla.	550	6	1[b]	1	1	--	Y	1
Lansing, Mich.	424	4	1[b]	1	1	[c]	N	1
Knoxville, Tenn.	409	4	1[b]	1	1	[c]	Y	1
Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.	370	5	1[b]	1	1	[c]	N	1
Fort Wayne, Ind.	361	4	1[b]	1	1	[c]	N	1
Evansville, Ind-Ky.	265	5	1[b]	1	1	--	N	1
Macon, Ga.	226	4	1[b]	1	1	--	N	1

Table D-2 continued

SMSA	SMSA Population (000)	Number of Counties	Eligible Prime Sponsors under S. 1559 Total	Counties	Cities	Other Under MRS	CEP	Number of CAMPS grants
(c) One Eligible Prime Sponsor, County or Consolidated City-County								
Indianapolis, Ind.	1,109	8	1	0	1[a]	1	N	1
Nashville, Tenn.	699	8	1	0	1[a]	--	Y	1
Jacksonville, Fla.	621	5	1	0	1[a]	--	Y	1
Baton Rouge, La.	375	4	1	0	1[a]	--	N	1
Huntington, W. Va.	286	5	1	1	0	--	N	0
Lexington, Ky.	266	6	1	0	1[a]	--	N	1
Kingsport-Bristol, Tenn.-Va.	241	5	1	1	0	--	N	0
Lima, Ohio	250	4	1	1	0	--	N	0
(d) No Eligible Prime Sponsors								
Terre Haute, Ind.	175	4	0	0	0	1	N	0
Fort Smith, Ark.-Okla.	160	4	0	0	0	--	N	0

[a] Consolidated city-county

[b] City or county but not both eligible

[c] Under MRS regulations both city and county eligible

E. New England SMSAs

SMSAs in the New England states present a different situation since they are constructed from cities and towns and do not follow county boundaries. This is because county government in New England is extremely weak compared to the other states and has even disappeared in Connecticut (although counties in Maine and New Hampshire and to some extent Vermont seem to be gaining strength). For purposes of manpower planning, the New England county is not considered a viable unit of local general government by federal officials.

The Hartford CMP project illustrates how local manpower planning can be organized on a multi-jurisdictional basis in New England. There a local CAMPs committee was organized by the community action agency in 1967 to serve the Hartford labor market area, consisting of the city and 26 surrounding towns (almost but not quite the same composition as the SMSA). At first the CAA manpower director served as chairman, but the mayor of Hartford took over this role in 1968. Two years later, with approval of City Council, Hartford received a CAMPS grant for manpower planning staff, which was placed under the city manager. Through further evolution the CAMPS committee became a MAPC with 40 members divided among public, manpower agency, and client representatives, and the MAPC now serves as the policy committee of the CMP project. This project was promoted by representatives of Hartford, MAPC staff, Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, and Greater Hartford Process (a private, area economic development group), and it received the endorsement of the Hartford City Council and the Capital Regional Council of Governments (the A-95 clearinghouse representing 29 municipalities). The MAPC staff has become the CMP staff, remaining under

the city manager's direction, and other staff resources are expected to be drawn from the CEP, which has been operated by the community action agency.

Eight other New England SMSAs have one city eligible to be a manpower prime sponsor under S. 1559 and MRS regulations, and the Boston SMSA has two (Boston amd Cambridge), as shown in Table E. Presumably something like the Hartford model might apply in these SMSAs though none seem as far along as Hartford. The other 16 New England SMSAs have no city over 100,000 and are not automatically eligible for prime sponsorship. For PEP, Massachusetts organized 24 multi-jurisdictional consortia, and they also function as AMPBs under CAMPS. Possibly the ones functioning in the smaller SMSAs could serve as manpower prime sponsor. New Hampshire, with two small SMSAs, has gone the route of a statewide program under CMP.

Table E. New England SMSAs

SMSA	Population (000) SMSA	Population (000) Largest City	CEP	CAMPS Grant
(a) Eligible Prime Sponsor				
Boston, Mass.	2,899	641[a]	Y	1 and 2[a]
Providence-Pawtucket-Warwick, R.I.-Mass.	905	179	Y	N
Hartford, Conn.	720	158	Y	1
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.-Conn.	541	163	Y	1
New Haven, Conn.	413	137	N	1
Bridgeport, Conn.	401	156	Y	1
Worcester, Mass.	372	176	N	1
Stamford, Conn.	206	108	N	1
Waterbury, Conn.	216	108	N	1
New Bedford, Mass.	161	101	Y	1
(b) No Eligible Prime Sponsor				
New London-Groton-Norwich, Conn.	241	41	N	N
Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.-N.H.	232	66	N	N
Lowell, Mass.	218	94	Y	N
Portland, Maine	170	65	Y	N
Fall River, Mass.-R.I.	169	96	N	N
Brockton, Mass.	150	89	N	N
New Britain, Conn.	145	83	N	N
Norwalk, Conn.	127	79	N	N
Manchester, N. H.	132	87	N	N
Danbury, Conn.	115	50	N	N
Fitchburg-Lewiston, Mass.	97	43	N	N
Pittsfield, Mass.	96	57	N	N
Nashua, N. H.	86	55	N	N
Lewiston-Auburn, Maine	72	41	N	N
Bristol, Conn.	69	55	N	N
Meriden, Conn.	55	55	N	N

[a] One additional eligible prime sponsor: Cambridge

CEP: N = no, Y = yes CAMPS: 1 = first round, 2 = second round

F. Virginia SMSAs

The State of Virginia has a unique form of local government because by established practice county government does not function within the territory of incorporated cities. In other words, cities and counties are independent of one another in both functions and geographic area.

In a way, this resembles the New England pattern except that cities and counties in Virginia's SMSAs tend to be fewer and more populous. Thus, one SMSA has three potential manpower prime sponsors and two SMSAs have two each so that the Hartford model with a leading central city would not be applicable. The other three SMSAs have no eligible jurisdictions though one has a CAMPS grant, as shown in Table F.

Table F. Virginia SMSAs

SMSA	SMSA Population (000)	Cities and Counties	Eligible Prime Sponsors	CEP	Number of CAMPS Grants
Norfolk-Portsmouth	687	5	3	Y	3
Richmond	542	7	2	N	2
New Port News-Hampton	333	6	2	N	2
Roanoke	203	4	0	N	1
Lynchburg	133	4	0	N	0
Petersburg-Colonial Heights	128	5	0	N	0

G. Multi-State SMSAs

Overlapping the previous classification are multi-state SMSAs, of which five fall into three states and 31 are in two states, as listed in Table G. From a labor market sense, the tri-state or bi-state area has a unity. But to organize a single, metropolitan manpower delivery system is complicated by federal funding formulas based upon states, by two (or three) sets of state agencies, and by different state laws on local government organization. Moreover, nineteen of them fall into two different federal regions.

None of the CMP projects are multi-state, and the one in a bi-state SMSA, Omaha, did not include the county in the other state. The only serious effort of bi-state, metropolitan manpower planning known to this writer is the effort of the Mid-American Regional Council functioning in the Kansas City SMSA. There are cases with notable achievements in bi-state planning and coordination in other fields, such as accomplished by the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council in the St. Louis area and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, so that this possibility need not be written off. But it will be one of the most difficult feats of manpower planning to achieve.

Table G. Multi-State SMSAs

SMSA	Population (000)	Number of Counties
(a) In three states		
Washington, D. C.-Md.-Va.	2,908	11[a]
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky-Ind.	1,384	7
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.-Miss.	834	4
Wilmington, Del.-N.J.-Md.	499	3
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio.	286	5
(b) In two states		
New York, N. Y.-N. J.	9,973	5[b]
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	4,817	8
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.	2,410	9
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.-Wisc.	1,965	11
Kansas City, Mo.- Kans.	1,271	7
Portland, Ore.-Wash.	1,009	4
Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass.	905	NE
Louisville, Ky.-Ind.	867	5
Toledo, Ohio-Mich.	762	5
Norfolk-Virginia-Beach-Portsmouth, Va.-N.C.	687	5[c]
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J.	594	4
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.-Conn.	541	NE
Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	540	3
Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.	370	6
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill.	362	3
Binghamton, N. Y.-Pa.	302	3
Evansville, Ky.-Ind.	284	5
Duluth-Superior, Minn.-Wis.	265	2
Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.-N.H.	258	NE
New London-Norwich, Conn.-R.I.	241	NE
Kingsport-Bristol, Tenn.-Va.	241	5[d]
Columbus, Ga.-Ala.	238	3
Lowell, Mass.-N.H.	218	NE
Wheeling, W. Va.-Ohio	182	3
Fall River, Mass.-R.I.	169	NE
Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio-W. Va.	165	3

Table G. continued

SMSA	Population (000)	Number of Counties
(b) In two states (cont'd)		
Fort Smith, Ark.-Okla	160	4
Parkersburg-Marietta, W. Va.-Ohio	148	3
Fargo-Moorhead, N. Dak.-Minn.	120	2
Sioux City, Iowa-Nebr.	116	2
Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.	112	3

---

[a] Includes three cities in Virginia independent of counties

[b] Counties within New York City not counted

[c] Includes four independent cities in Virginia

[d] Includes an independent city in Virginia

NE = New England

H. Summary on Prime Sponsorship within SMSAs

Of the 263 SMSAs, 170 would have one or more units of local government eligible to become a prime sponsor under S. 1559, and 211 SMSAs would be so situated under the MRS regulations. Altogether S. 1559 would produce 318 potential local prime sponsors and the MRS regulations 395, not counting the possibility of additional prime sponsors organized as consortia for smaller SMSAs.

Previous discussion has divided the SMSAs by number of counties, but they can be lumped together in order to determine the pattern of prime sponsorship without regard to inclusion or exclusion of outlying jurisdictions which are ineligible on their own. When this is done, eleven patterns emerge for the SMSAs with at least one eligible prime sponsor, as presented in Table H.

The CMP projects offer five patterns. The Luzerne model of only one county eligible is applicable to 48 SMSAs under S. 1559 and 87 under the MRS regulations. The models of Albuquerque and Omaha (at the core) -- with city prime sponsorship when either the city or county but not both could be prime sponsor -- could be utilized in 42 SMSAs under S. 1559 and 22 under the MRS regulations, but in any of these the county, not the city, could be the prime sponsor instead (not within CMP experience). The Dade model of county prime sponsorship when two cities are also eligible would apply in only one other SMSA (Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood). In addition to Seattle, which offers a consortium model, eight other SMSAs have the central city and two counties eligible under S. 1559 and 12 under the MRS regulations. The Hartford model might apply to eight other New England SMSAs. Altogether under S. 1559, 110 SMSAs have patterns similar to the ones served by CMP projects, and 133 under the MRS regulations.

Of the cases not similar to CMP areas, seven represent a consolidated city-county eligible alone under S. 1559 and six under the MRS regulations. In 28 SMSAs both the city and the county would be eligible under S. 1559 and 44 under the MRS regulations (represented by San Diego in earlier discussion). Four SMSAs would have two counties but no cities eligible under either approach. One New England SMSA (Boston) would have two eligible cities. Under S. 1559 six SMSAs would have three or four eligible prime sponsors but in combinations different than the Seattle model (though a consortium might be appropriate), and seven would be like this under the MRS regulations. Finally, 14 SMSAs would have five or more eligible prime sponsors under S. 1559 and 16 under the MRS regulations, a situation not displayed by any of the CMP projects.

From this analysis, it becomes apparent that two basic patterns which exist in quantity are not represented in the CMP experience. One is the situation where both the central city and the surrounding county are eligible; this would occur more frequently under the MRS regulations since the county population outside a designated city would have to be only 100,000 instead of the 150,000 required by S. 1559. The other frequent pattern is where from three to nine prime sponsors would be eligible within a single SMSA; while the Seattle experience casts some light on one variation of this pattern, there are many other complexities unexplored.

There remains the question of the validity of the basic premise of CMP: that a unified manpower services delivery system should be developed for a labor market area. As noted before, legislative history shows first a push for this approach, then a rejection with stress mainly upon political jurisdictions, and more recently a combined emphasis with political jurisdictions eligible but functioning labor market areas encouraged. The CMP experience

indicates that it is possible to organize multi-jurisdictional manpower programs, for this is how seven out of nine are constituted. This was achieved through local leadership, supported by sympathetic DOL personnel. Yet to be tested is (1) whether these areawide CMPs are able to develop a system related to needs and opportunities in the whole labor market area and (2) whether this makes any difference to job-seekers and employers than the present approach of scattered categorical programs or an alternative of separate program packages operated by a number of jurisdictions within the same labor market area.

If the labor market area approach is proven valid, the CMP experience already has shown that each area must be approached individually and must be permitted flexibility in order to develop the kind of structure which fits the particular area. Organization according to a made-in-Washington formula is erroneous.

IV. MANPOWER ORGANIZATION FOR BALANCE OF STATE

S. 1559 and the MRS regulations make only cities and counties above a specified minimum eligible to become prime sponsors although both make provisions for consortia of other local governmental units to gain recognition as prime sponsors. The portions of a state not served by local prime sponsors then become the responsibility of state government. Manpower organization for balance-of-state therefore complements metropolitan manpower organization.

Three of the CMP projects are state administered, and their experience can provide insights on balance-of-state manpower planning and program coordination. How the states will go about this task will also be influenced by two approaches adopted by the Labor Department in 1971.

In May 1971 the Department of Labor reorganized the CAMPS structure. At the local and state level, the DOL issuance specified the organization of (a) Manpower Area Planning Councils (MAPC) in designated areas under the leadership of the mayors of the principal cities and (b) State Manpower Planning Councils (SMPC) under the governors. The governors were given the option of organizing Ancillary Manpower Planning Boards (AMPB) in non-metropolitan districts, and if they did so, they were instructed to consider the requirements of OMB Circular A-95, which encourages use of common or consistent planning and development districts within states for all federally supported programs.

According to the state CAMPS plans for Fiscal Year 1974, all the states but one (Oklahoma) have established AMPBs, ranging from one AMPB in Delaware (plus one MAPC) to 31 in New Mexico (one for each non-metropolitan county). The medium number is eight, and the distribution is as follows:

Number of AMPBs	Number of States
5 and less	9
6 to 10	25
11 to 15	13
16 and more	3

Many of the states have made AMPB districts coterminous with planning and development districts used for other programs, particularly where the governor has made a serious effort to have such common districts utilized for many programs. Elsewhere district organization is fragmentary or nonexistent, and AMPBs follow their own patterns.

In July 1971 the Emergency Employment Act became law, and DOL made a decision to use as program agents states and cities and counties of 75,000 or more in population. This gave state government responsibility for the Public Employment Program in balance-of-state, but DOL guidelines were silent on how the states should manage this task. Only two states handled all balance-of-state PEP jobs directly, and the rest made positions available to local government, as follows:

Assignment of Balance-of-state PEP Jobs	Number of States
State only	2
Municipalities only	5
Counties only	12
Municipalities and counties	31

Thus, the majority of states assigned PEP jobs to both cities and counties and in some instances to school districts and other special purpose districts. In addition, nine states utilized councils of governments or some other form

of multi-county body for PEP planning and/or administration; in most cases, this involved the A-95 clearinghouse organizations.

Although the states have this common background experience with manpower programs in balance-of-state, the states differ significantly in characteristics of area, population, and governmental structure. This will affect how they handle balance-of-state under MRS or a manpower block grant program. To understand these differences, the discussion which follows groups states according to population concentration and geographic size -- factors which seem to be influential. State CMP experience is cited where relevant.

For purpose of this analysis, the 50 states and District of Columbia are divided into two principal groups: metropolitan and nonmetropolitan. As a working definition, any state with more than half its population in SMSAs is considered metropolitan.

The 19 nonmetropolitan states are then divided into two types, based on whether they would have any local prime sponsors of manpower programs, and the geographic factors are considered. All 32 metropolitan states (including D. C.) would have one or more eligible local prime sponsors and they are divided into types which consider population, geographic area, and patterns of settlement.

I. Nonmetropolitan States with No Eligible Local Prime Sponsor

By the provisions of S. 1559, nine states would have no eligible local prime sponsors, as shown in Table I (but one would have a county eligible under the MRS regulations). These are all nonmetropolitan states since population outside SMSAs is three-fourths or more in seven of them and over 60 percent in the other two. New Hampshire, with a CMP, is in this group.

New Hampshire model. State initiative for manpower planning has come about in New Hampshire under Governor Meldrim Thomson, Jr., who took office in January 1971 and is now in his second two-year term. The previous governor had declined a DOL offer of a manpower planning grant, and the CAMPS plan prepared by the Department of Employment Security was turned back for revision three years in a row by the DOL regional office. After his inauguration Governor Thomson accepted federal manpower planning funds and created the Office of Manpower Affairs. He could do little to reform the Department of Employment Security since the commissioner has life tenure. So instead he gradually added to the programs managed by the Office of Manpower Affairs, which by the beginning of his second term had responsibility for WIN, JOBS, JOPS, TMRP, EEA, and CAMPS. This set the stage for New Hampshire becoming a CMP, an arrangement worked out between the DOL regional office and the governor. Now the Office of Manpower Affairs will also be in charge of planning and administering MDTA, Operation Mainstream, Job Corps, NYC, and other manpower programs. Someof these have been run by the Department of Employment Security and community action agencies, and they will continue to handle operations, but under subcontract with the Office of Manpower Affairs rather than through a direct federal grant. The six AMPBs will continue to function in an advisory capacity (there are no MAPCs), but the CMP will operate as a statewide program.

Elsewhere. It is conceivable that the New Hampshire CMP model might be adaptable to the other two northern New England states, Vermont and Maine. But there are differences. In Vermont the Employment Service is more responsive and handled PEP administration. In Maine county government is the strongest of the six New England states and played a role in PEP. These factors would not prevent a statewide program but would alter its shape.

The other six nonmetropolitan states with no eligible local prime sponsors are in the West. Their much larger areas than New Hampshire's introduces a different situation. Several of them, such as the two Dakotas, have well-defined multi-county districts which have AMPBs and serve for other programs as well. Because of the geographic spread, it seems likely that such district boards might need to play a larger role in state-run manpower programs than is necessary in New Hampshire. (This would introduce an ingredient of the South Carolina CMP.)

Table I. Nonmetropolitan States with No Eligible Local Prime Sponsors

State	Number of SMSAS	State Population (000)	Percent in SMSAs	Per square mile
(1) Northern New England				
Vermont	0	444	0.0%	48
Maine	2	992	21.6	32
New Hampshire	2 + 1	737	30.4	82
(2) Western				
Wyoming	0	332	0.0	3
North Dakota	1	617	11.9	9
South Dakota	1	665	14.3	9
Idaho*	1	712	15.8	8
Montana	2	694	24.4	5
Alaska	1	300	37.3	0.5

Number of SMSAs: a + b = SMSAs with principal city in state + secondary part of multi-state SMSA.

* One county eligible under MRS, but not S. 1559.

J. Nonmetropolitan States with One or More Eligible Local Prime Sponsors

Ten nonmetropolitan states (with 55 to 79 percent or more of the population outside SMSAs), listed in Table J, have one or more cities and counties eligible to be local prime sponsors. One is South Carolina, which has a CMP project.

South Carolina model. The South Carolina CMP resulted from the initiative of Governor John C. West and Richard F. Marr, Director of Administration in the governor's office. (The latter had previously been a private consultant to a rural CEP in South Carolina.) Among other units under Marr is the Office of Manpower Planning and Coordination, which has prepared the state CAMPS. The CMP is built from CAMPS and will be carried out through eight AMPBs and two MAPCs, which function in the ten A-95 planning districts previously established by the governor. The two MAPCs have had staff working for the mayors of Charleston and Columbia, and the governor had to work out an agreement with the mayors to gain their recognition and support of the state CMP. This took some delicate negotiations, but it was probably no more difficult than obtaining the cooperation of the State Employment Service. Under the CMP, each AMPB and MAPC has some, though not unlimited, flexibility of program design, and some have kept most of the categorical programs with existing sponsors while others intended to utilize a CEP-type delivery system.

Elsewhere. Six nonmetropolitan states east of the 95th meridian are similar in settlement pattern to South Carolina because the population is fairly well distributed throughout the state and no large metropolis is dominant. These states, too, could use multi-county district boards for manpower planning. In North Carolina and Kentucky such boards fulfilled a planning

role in PEP and are the foundation for area manpower planning. West Virginia and Iowa also use A-95 districts as the basis for manpower planning. In such states, it would be possible to mix in a few MAPC-type operations with federal grants directly to local prime sponsors without unduely damaging the South Carolina CMP model.

The three states west of the 95th meridian are somewhat different in structure due to a pattern of settlement related to rainfall and water supply. Kansas and Nebraska are more heavily populated in their eastern portions and with lesser density in the semi-arid western sections. Thus, Kansas has three SMSAs in the eastern third and Nebraska two. New Mexico has population concentrated in its one SMSA, Albuquerque, and to a somewhat lesser extent in the Rio Grande valley to the north. In these states, it might be that the SMSAs will have their own programs and that the state could conduct a western version of the New Hampshire model in balance-of-state (like the Dakotas) with active AMPBs advising the state-run program.

Table J. Nonmetropolitan States with One or More Eligible Local Prime Sponsors

State	Number of SMSAs	State Population (000)	State Population Percent in SMSAs	State Population Per square mile	Land area in sq. mile (000)
(1) West of 95th Meridian					
New Mexico	1	1,016	32.8	8	121.6
Nebraska	2 + 1	1,483	42.8	19	77.7
Kansas	2 + 1	2,246	43.8	28	82.2
(2) East of 95th Meridian					
Mississippi	2 + 1	2,216	21.2	47	47.7
Arkansas	4 + 2	1,923	34.3	37	53.1
Iowa	6 + 1	3,824	36.5	51	56.3
West Virginia	4 + 1	1,744	38.0	73	24.1
South Carolina	3 + 1	2,590	40.5	86	31.0
North Carolina	7	5,082	44.7	104	52.6
Kentucky	3 + 3	3,218	45.2	81	40.3

Number of SMSAs: a + b = SMSAs with principal city in state + secondary part of multistate SMSA.

K. Geographically Large Western Metropolitan States with One Dominant SMSA

Another pattern is apparent in the Mountain and Pacific Northwest regions. The states are large in area, but settlement is concentrated in two or three SMSAs. Population ranges from 61 to 81 percent metropolitan, as Table K indicates. The Utah CMP operates in such a state.

Utah model. In Utah 78 percent of the population is concentrated in the Wasatch Front containing the combined Salt Lake City-Ogden SMSA and the smaller Provo-Orem SMSA. It is natural for state government to give considerable attention to this area because most of the citizens live there. For manpower planning this tendency was reinforced in 1969 when Governor Calvin Rampton at the start of his second four-year term got the state legislature to establish a Manpower Planning Council with considerable powers. As chairman the governor appointed Thayne Robson and as executive director Kenneth Olson, who was also state planning coordinator. Robson and his colleague at the University of Utah, Garth Mangum, had served in Washington and were full of ideas about manpower reform, and Olson was a former state legislator with political savvy. At that time, J. Bracken Lee was mayor of Salt Lake City and as a conservative he opposed city involvement in manpower planning so that Salt Lake City was not a competitor to the state. Indeed, the main resistance to the Manpower Planning Council came from the Department of Employment Security.

Having taken charge of CAMPS, the Manpower Planning Council also developed the PEP program. Governor Rampton negotiated an arrangement with the mayors of cities eligible to be PEP program agents to permit the state to be the sole program agent for Utah, and in exchange he turned over to localities all state jobs under the program. For area planning PEP utilized associations of governments which function in seven multi-county planning districts established by

the governor in 1970. CMP represents the next evolutionary stage by focusing all manpower programs through the Manpower Planning Council as state prime sponsor and by using the association of governments to allocate funds in their areas. One interjurisdictional agreement was required between the governor and the present mayor of Salt Lake City, E. J. Garn, who was chairman of the only MAPC in the state.

Elsewhere. Three other Mountain states have a similar metropolitan concentration, but they have a different political situation. Denver has a more aggressive city government than Salt Lake City did in the past, and the governor of Colorado is new, having moved up from lieutenant governor when his predecessor resigned to become energy advisor in the White House. Phoenix, Tucson, and the Navajo Nation have a habit of running their own programs, but in the rest of Arizona councils of governments have been involved in PEP and CAMPS. In Nevada state government is not as active as in Utah, and Las Vegas has been running manpower programs for several years. In the Pacific Northwest with almost as much metropolitan concentration, the Seattle-Everett SMSA already has its own CMP, and it seems likely that the Portland SMSA will seek its own program.

This analysis suggests that the Utah model will not be applicable in these other western states with similar population configuration. Instead, the SMSAs, particularly the larger ones will have their own programs, and the balance-of-state program will have to cope with more sparsely settled population. For the latter, Utah's use of COGs may offer some helpful suggestions.

Table K. Metropolitan State, Geographically Large, One Dominant SMSA

State	Number of SMSAs	State Population (000)	Percent in SMSA	Per square mile
(1) Pacific Northwest				
Oregon	3	2,091	61.2	23
Washington	5 + 1	3,409	72.8	51
(2) Mountains				
Colorado	3	2,207	71.7	21
Arizona	2	1,770	74.5	16
Utah	2	1,059	78.5	13
Nevada	2	488	80.7	4

Number of SMSAs: a + b = SMSAs with principal city within state + secondary part of multistate SMSA.

L. Middle-Size Metropolitan States

The next group of states are ten of middle-size which have from 54 to 65 percent of the population living in SMSAs, as indicated in Table L. Among the 50 states they are in the middle range of geographic area and total population. They are in transition from predominantly rural and not-too-large cities to significant population concentration in metropolitan areas. None of the state CMPs have dealt with this situation although some CMP experience might be transferrable.

These middle-size metropolitan states can be divided into two types. The first type has one SMSA which is clearly dominant in size and economic importance and consequently is a major factor in state politics. They are Wisconsin with Milwaukee, Minnesota with Minneapolis-St. Paul, Louisiana with New Orleans, and Georgia with Atlanta. These SMSAs will surely have their own manpower prime sponsors, and under S. 1559 they could have from 2 for the New Orleans SMSA to 5 within the Twin Cities area. While the metropolitan prime sponsors might cooperate with state government, they will insist upon taking their own initiative; and they are connected with national municipal organizations which will protect their independence.

The second type has two or more major SMSAs without one being so dominant in size, economic significance, and political influence. Thus, Missouri has St. Louis and Kansas City; Indiana has Indianapolis and the Gary-Hammond-Lake County area; sizable metropolitan concentration is found in Northern Virginia and in the Norfolk-Newport News area; Alabama has Birmingham, Mobile, and Montgomery; in Oklahoma are Oklahoma City and Tulsa; and Tennessee has four major centers in Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Knoxville. This means

that within these states metropolitan interests have to be represented by coalition politics, and since a metropolitan majority is fairly recent, this is not clearly expressed as a conscious manifestation. But such areas are likely to have their own manpower prime sponsorship rather than go through the state.

Most of these ten states have additional small SMSAs, which will have an opportunity to have manpower prime sponsors of their own. In some cases they might be willing to be part of a state program, as those in South Carolina have under CMP, but likely a majority would prefer to receive direct federal funding. This leaves state government directly responsible for half or less of the population, and it means that a total state plan would have to encompass significant elements independently determined by prime sponsors under local government in metropolitan areas. This is not an impossible arrangement for manpower planning and program management, but it is a different situation than any of the state CMPs.

Table L. Middle-Size Metropolitan States

State	Number of SMSAS	State Population (000)	Percent in SMSA	Per square mile
(1) One SMSA Dominant				
Minnesota	4 + 1	3,804	63.5	48
Louisiana	7	3,641	61.9	81
Wisconsin	7 + 2	4,417	58.3	81
Georgia	6 + 1	4,585	57.1	79
(2) Two or More Major SMSAs				
Virginia	6 + 2	4,648	65.1	117
Missouri	5	4,676	65.0	68
Indiana	9 + 2	5,193	64.0	144
Alabama	7 + 1	3,444	58.7	68
Oklahoma	3 + 1	2,559	55.1	37
Tennessee	5	3,923	53.8	95

Number of SMSAs: a + b = SMSAs with principal city within state + secondary part of multistate SMSA.

M. Geographically Small Metropolitan States

The remaining states have more than three-fourths of their population living in SMSAs. One group consists of six states small in geographic area, and among them are four different types.

The District of Columbia, treated as a state under S. 1559 and the MRS regulations, is a city-state with no rural territory. Presently it lacks home rule in manpower planning since DOL's Manpower Administration has a special D. C. unit and the Employment Service is a federal agency. Nonetheless, there are a host of locally-run manpower programs, a bewildering complexity as the General Accounting Office has recently documented. The first challenge will be to develop manpower planning capability within the District government and to pull together programs within D. C. The second and greater challenge will be to forge a metropolitan approach involving two states and as many as 6 potential local prime sponsors. None of the CMP metropolitan projects, nor the state CMPs, have faced such difficulties.

Rhode Island, Hawaii, and Delaware are city-states with rural appendages, and this presents a different set of problems. Rhode Island is the most concentrated because it has the smallest area and 83 percent of the population lives in the Providence SMSA; relationships between public officials in Providence and state government will be crucially important. The same holds true for Delaware and the City of Wilmington officials but complicated by the fact that Wilmington is under 100,000 and not eligible to be a prime sponsor even though it has had a CAMPS planning grant (New Castle County is, though); furthermore, the state has two rural counties, a traditional source of schism. Hawaii has a similar situation with a metropolitan city-county with 82 percent

of the state's population and two nonmetropolitan counties, but separation of the islands by water is a unique characteristic. In terms of population concentration, these three states are like Utah, but the geographical scale is so different that the Utah CMP model probably has little applicability.

Maryland is binodal with metropolitan concentrations in the Baltimore area and the Washington suburbs. The Baltimore SMSA is contained wholly within the state and has 53 percent of the state population, but it does not function with much planning or administrative unity. Next door to Washington two counties each over half a million are the major governmental entities in Maryland. The state also has three rural areas: the eastern shore, a penisula between the Potomac River and Cheasepeake Bay, and western Maryland. Since metropolitan unity is lacking and the nonmetropolitan districts are fairly distinct zones, there is an opportunity for state leadership in manpower planning even if there are several prime sponsors in the metropolitan areas.

Connecticut is multinodal, containing 11 SMSAs with the central city within the state. Hartford, the largest with a population of 168,000, already has a CMP which serves the metropolitan area. With this start and with presumptive prime sponsorship for four other cities, it seems unlikely that Connecticut could have a single, statewide manpower program. But since many of the cities and SMSAs are relatively small and inexperienced in manpower planning, state government can offer leadership through technical assistance and staff training and maybe can even work out a statewide consortium arrangement which would mobilize the combined efforts of legally independent prime sponsors.

Table M. Metropolitan States, Geographically Small

State	Number of SMSAs	State Population (000)	Percent in SMSA	Per square mile
(1) City-State				
District of Columbia	1	756	100.0	12,402
(2) City-state with rural appendage				
Rhode Island	1 + 1	946	84.7	903
Hawaii	1	768	81.9	120
Delaware	1	548	70.4	277
(3) Binodal state				
Maryland	1 + 2	3,972	85.5	397
(4) Multinodal state				
Connecticut	11 + 1	3,031	82.9	623

Number of SMSAs: a + b = SMSAs with principal city within state + secondary part of multistate SMSA.

N. Mega-States

The last group consists of the ten mega-states -- those with the largest populations, containing from 76 to 93 percent in SMSAs. Like the middle-size metropolitan states, they can be divided into two types.

The first type has one dominant metropolis: New York, New York; Chicago, Illinois; Detroit, Michigan; and Boston, Massachusetts. These SMSAs contain from 47 to 63 percent of state population, and by the principle of one-man, one-vote, they have considerable influence within state government. Conversely state government has a strong interest in public programs within the SMSAs. The mayors are major political figures, many times at odds with the governors, and relationships between state and local manpower agencies will have overtones of this rivalry. At the same time each state has from six to ten other SMSAs which can have prime sponsors, and the four states are left with direct responsibility for manpower services to only 15 to 25 percent of the state's population. This creates a situation not comparable to any of the state CMPs.

The other type has two or more major SMSAs within each state, which produces a different pattern of local-state relationships than the first type, more pluralistic from the state's viewpoint, more like a confederation of local interests from the city's perspective. California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, and Florida each has two or three SMSAs larger than others. New Jersey has spillover SMSAs from New York and Philadelphia. Balance-of-state outside SMSAs ranges from 6 percent in New Jersey to 24 percent in Texas so that state government's direct role is significantly less than the combined metropolitan manpower program. This does not mean that these states cannot make important contributions to solving manpower problems and promoting better employment opportunities but rather that quite a different state approach will be necessary than the state CMPs now have underway.

Table N. Mega-States

State	Number of SMSAS	State Population (000)	Percent in SMSA	Per square Mile
(1) One SMSA dominant				
New York	10	18,236	89.0	381
Massachusetts	10 + 1	5,689	84.7	727
Michigan	11 + 1	8,875	82.7	156
Illinois	7 + 2	11,113	80.6	199
(2) Two or more major SMSAs				
New Jersey	8 + 3	7,168	94.1	953
California	17	19,953	93.3	128
Florida	14	6,789	84.0	126
Pennsylvania	12 + 1	11,793	81.2	262
Ohio	14 + 3	10,652	80.8	260
Texas	24	11,196	76.3	43

Number of SMSAs: a + b = SMSAs with principal city within state + secondary part of multistate SMSA.

O. Summary on State Prime Sponsorship

Manpower legislation and regulations define "state" to include the 50 states plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This report has considered only the 50 states and the District of Columbia and how they might organize to be manpower prime sponsors.

These states can be divided into two principal groups: metropolitan and nonmetropolitan using 50 percent or more of the population in SMSAs as a working definition of metropolitan. They can be further divided into six major subgroups, as shown in Table O.

The 19 nonmetropolitan states have two subgroups for purposes of this analysis. The first subgroup consists of nine states which would have no eligible local manpower prime sponsors under the provisions of S. 1559. The New Hampshire CMP presents a model for this type of state, but as previous discussion revealed, there is a geographic difference between three Northern New England states of compact area and six western states with population scattered over a larger territory. The second subgroup contains ten states which could have one or more eligible local prime sponsors. The South Carolina CMP is of this variety, and it might serve as a model for seven states east of the 95th meridian which have settlement fairly evenly dispersed throughout the state. The three remaining states have semi-arid sections which are sparsely populated, and this pattern of settlement might require a somewhat different approach.

The 32 metropolitan states can be classified into four subgroups. Six geographically large western states have one dominant SMSA; one of them is

Utah which has a statewide CMP, but this approach is unlikely to be duplicated in the other five states because the leading SMSAs will probably have their own prime sponsors. At the other end of the size spectrum are six geographically small states, four with a single dominant metropolis, one binodal and one multi-nodal; none of the CMPs are of this type. Nor does CMP provide a model for the ten mega-states nor ten middle-size metropolitan states.

Altogether less than half of the states can look to the Comprehensive Manpower Porgram for a statewide model for manpower prime sponsorship. Nevertheless, some of the CMP experience is relevant to state government's responsibility for balance-of-state manpower programs outside metropolitan areas. Due to the influence of CAMPS, the A-95 directive, and PEP in a few states, most likely balance-of-state will be handled through a network of multi-jurisdictional planning and coordinating bodies. The AMPBs of CAMPS provide some experience of this sort, and the South Carolina and Utah CMPs carry this a step farther by tying manpower planning to officially defined substate planning districts and A-95 clearinghouses. Massachusetts has used consortia of cities and towns for PEP and CAMPS, illustrating what can be done without county government as a building block. It could be profitable to undertake considerably more study of manpower planning and coordination in substate, nonmetropolitan districts.

Finally, the three state CMPs and all other state manpower planning efforts we know about are limited to planning for the delivery system of manpower services. In a report the Center issued three years ago we suggested that the states should also be encouraged to undertake broader manpower planning. As stated in that report:

> We perceive broader manpower planning as undertaking the following tasks: examination of present and future economy of the state, particularly labor market projections; determination of kinds of occupational skills that will be needed at all levels -- managers and professionals, clerical and sales workers, craftsmen and foremen, service workers, skilled operators and laborers -- planning the educational, training, recruitment and placement programs needed to produce the required labor force at the right time and place; study of present and future population in the state, especially the unemployed and underemployed, and their job needs; planning for the delivery of manpower services to serve the disadvantaged and the technologically unemployed.
>
> Manpower planning of this breadth would involve the efforts of universities, colleges, and their governing boards; economic, industrial, and physical development planning bodies; agencies responsible for vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, public welfare, and employment services; and the leadership and coordinating input of the governor and department of administration.*

If states would broaden their approach to encompass these tasks which require a statewide scope, they could incorporate locally determined plans for the manpower delivery system in metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan districts -- as they would also incorporate plans developed by the higher education network and economic development agencies. By doing what only it can do and by leaving to localities the details of delivery service planning, the state would achieve more and lessen unnecessary competition for control of locally delivered manpower services.

---

* State Manpower Organization. Center for Governmental Studies, Washington, D. C., 1970. p. 67.

Table O. Major State Groups by Extent of Metropolitanization

State Group (number of states)	Number of SMSAs*	State Population (000)	Percent in SMSAs
A. Nonmetropolitan (19)			
1. No eligible local prime sponsors (9)	0 to 2	300 to 992	0.0 to 37.3%
2. With one or more eligible local prime sponsors (10)	1 to 7	1,016 to 5,082	21.2 to 45.2
B. Metropolitan (32)			
1. Middle size (10)	3 to 9	2,559 to 5,193	53.8 to 65.1
2. Geographically large, western with one dominant SMSA (6)	2 to 5	498 to 3,409	61.2 to 80.7
3. Mega-states (10)	7 to 24	5,689 to 19,953	76.3 to 94.1
4. Geographically small (6)	1 to 11	548 to 3,972	70.4 to 100.0

* Those with principal city in the state.

GLOSSARY

A-95	Circular No. A-95 of the Office of Management and Budget
AMPB	Ancillary Manpower Planning Board
CAA	Community Action Agency
CAMPS	Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System
CAO	Chief Administrative Officer
CEP	Concentrated Employment Program
CMP	Comprehensive Manpower Program
COG	Council of Governments
CWTP	Community Work and Training Program
DOL	Department of Labor
EEA	Emergency Employment Act of 1971
EOA	Economic Opportunity Act of 1964
ESP	Employment Supplement Program
JOBS	Job Opportunity in the Business Sector
JOPS	Job Opportunity in the Public Sector
MAPC	Manpower Area Planning Council
MDTA	Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962
MRS	Manpower Revenue Sharing
NYC	Neighborhood Youth Corps
PEP	Public Employment Program
OEO	Office of Economic Opportunity
OIC	Opportunities Industrialization Center
OJT	On-the-Job Training
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
SER	Operation SER
SMSA	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area
SMPC	State Manpower Planning Council
TMRP	Technological Mobilization and Re-employment Program
WIN	Work Incentive Program